

# PEACEABLE DISQUISITIONS.

Which Treat

*The Natural and Spiritual Man.  
Preaching with the Demonstration of  
the Spirit.  
Praying by the Spirit. Assurance.  
Of The Arminian Grace. Possibility of  
Heathens Salvation.  
The reconciliation of Paul and James  
The Imputation of Christ's Righteous-  
ness ; with other Incident Matters.*

In some Animadversions

**On a Discourse writ against**  
*Dr. OWEN'S Book of the Holy Spirit.*

By JOHN HUMFREY.

*Doing nothing by Partiality.*

LONDON, Printed for *Thomas Parkhurst*, at the *Three  
Crowns and Bible*, the lower end of *Cheapside*. 1678.





# Peaceable Disquisitions.

## CHAP. I.

*Of the right understanding of the Apostles Natural and Spiritual man, and of Preaching with the Demonstration of the Spirit and of Power.*

**H**AVING met with a Book entituled, *A discourse concerning the operations of the Holy Spirit, in confutation of Dr. Owen upon that Subject*, I cannot but be tempted to make some Animadversions upon it, whether out of *consent* to the Authour in many things, or *dissent* in others : for a Resentment to see how nothing almost of this Doctor's can come abroad (though in matters onely practical, and not polemical) but there is a generation of men upon the wing ready to fly upon it, as if they were never satisfied unless they could render that worthy person quite useles to the Church in all his Labours, is enough to put me upon it.

I do acknowledge that this fresh Antagonist of his does appear to me to be a man of very smart abilities, and of a masculine style, regarding his conceptions without affectation of words, for which I value him, and I am beholding to him for the pleasure which he hath given me in the liberality of his notions : yet do I think really that he and his consorts, such as the Authour of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, and the like, are to be blamed for two things.

The one is, their *Immorality* (as I judge of it) in treating such men as Doctor Owen as they do, with so much slighting and contempt, and that without

either any *regret* of conscience for the injustice and wrong (which to speak unworthily of the worthy must be) or *due reflexion* upon their own mortality and imperfections: And who are we, that enter into comparison?

The other is, their intrenchment on *things sacred* with the same boldness and liberty of *sarcasme* as in *things common*; whereby in their endeavor to expose a Party, and this Doctor to scorn, they do bring Religion it self into a lighter estimation. I speak this chiefly in regard to some Books writ by way of Dialogue; for I find this Gentleman restraining himself one place upon that account.

I will suppose this Authour to have studied Divinity about *Ten* years, allotting his former life for other accomplishments, and the Dr. to have studied these things *Forty* years: I do think now, if this Gentleman had had a little misgiving in his mind at the consideration of this imparity, and thereupon expressed, if not more *Respect*, yet some more *Modesty* towards the Dr. it would have cast some better grace on his undertaking.

In this Preface, the Dr. belike having said in one of his Books, speaking to the people, *You are in a miserable condition, if you have all this while relyed upon the authority of men in heavenly things.* This seems to imply (saies the Gentleman) that all men are in a state of damnation who rely upon the honesty and wisdom of their Spiritual Guides in matters of Faith: But --- I hope some of those do so firmly believe the Truth, upon the Testimony of God's Ministers; as to live according to it; which if they do, God forbid that.

that I should say they are in a damnable condition. If I may take my conjecture from this less virulent passage in the *Preface*, into what odious constructions the Drs. words are like to be wiredrawn still throughout the *Book*; it will be to no purpose I count for me to go about the redeeming the Dr. from abuses, which are so multiplied upon him of all sorts, and on all occasions, as pleases these Authours prejudicate minds: but to attend rather other matters, which shall administer occasion for the striking of light, or the free pursuit and improvement of Truth, that shall offer it self as we go along, to our mutual edification.

This is my opinion, that Dr. *Owen* is a man of that eminent Learning, and all sorts of Worth, both as a *Scholar* and *Civil Gentleman*, that he deserves other Treatment from these men, and is above my Vindication.

In this *Book*, after the *Preface*, we have an *Introduction*, and Seven *Chapters*.

The *Introduction* presents us with a dissertation about one place of the *Apostle*, which is much canvassed in the *Arminian Controversie*, and does therefore require our first attendance. The words are these, *The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness to him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.*

By the *Natural man*, this worthy person understands one that is governed onely by *Reason*: and by the *Spiritual man*, he understands him that receives and judges of things by the *Scriptures*. The

natural man now (saies he) receives not those Doctrines of Christianity, the truth whereof is not discoverable by natural reason, because they are *foolishness to him*, in that they cannot be proved hereby: and he *cannot know them*, because they are *spiritually discerned*, that is, because they are made known onely by *Revelation*, which the natural man either hath not, or rejects. See here an interpretation which looks grave and solid as well as ingenious; but whether it be indeed the right or no, we are to judge by the consistency of it with the place. In the twelfth verse before the Text, the Apostle saies, *That we have received the Spirit of God, that we may know the things*, which he had before called *the deep things of God*: And in the verse next after the Text he tells us, *The spiritual man judgeth all things*. It is apparent then that the *spiritual man* in the one verse, and he that hath *received the Spirit* in the other, must be one: But the Revelation of the Scriptures *without* us to judge of things by, and the Spirit of God *within*, either inspiring these things, or operating on the mind to understand them, are two things, and consequently, if the *spiritual man* be him that hath *received the Spirit* within to *know the things of God*, it must not be him that hath onely received the *Scriptures*, and rejects them not. Besides this, a man may receive the Scriptures as the Revelation of God, and judge of Doctrines by it, and be much skill'd in the letter of it, as the *Socinians* are, and yet not receive the great mystery thereof, *God manifested in the flesh*: And how does the *spiritual man* judge of all things, if this be the spiritual man? Nay, how can it be said of him,

him, that *he is judged of none*, seeing as he *judges all things* by these Scriptures, so is he *judged of all*, in what he holds, by the same ?

There is another interpretation therefore (for it is another, and this Authour must not compound his with it) to be laid down in the second place. By the *natural man*, which is *unregenerate*, we may understand him who hath onely the *unregenerate*, or reasonable soul derived from *Adam* ; and by the spiritual man him who hath received the *regenerate*, or that Spirit which is from Christ. *The first man Adam was made a living soul, the second Adam was made a quickening spirit.* This Spirit, as it was promised to be poured out upon men in the *latter daies*, which was the time of the New Testament ; so do we find it given ordinarily at their Baptism and Confirmation ; as we read in the *Acts*, and as we find in this Epistle. *The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withall.* Where we have this Spirit given, and that to every one : and the *Manifestation* of it, *manifestum est omnibus*. That *manifestation* possibly might be by some *Shechinah*, sometimes on the heads of the baptized : but the certain meaning appears in the following verses, to be by the miraculous gifts then poured out. Among which gifts, one of them was the *Discernment* of mysteries, *Spirits*, that is, *Doctrines* ; and so is the Spirit given and received (we are to suppose) in this place. *We have received the Spirit of God*, saies the Text, to this effect, *That we may know the things which he hath freely given us.* The whole meaning then is thus, the *unregenerate*, the man who had not this Spirit then poured on him, could

could not discern those things of the Spirit as others of them could, who had it, because these *hidden things* were discoverable by that miraculous gift; and he having not the *Gift* to discern them, must judge of them by *natural reason* onely, and so they were *foolishness to him*; when as to them who had it, they appeared the *Power of God, and Wisdom of God*. And of this *Spiritual man* so interpreted, that is, the inspired man, one that had the *mind of Christ* in the last verse, and that *received the Spirit* in the tenth, for this effect, the discernment of these things; it is easie to understand how he could *judge all things*, and be *judged of none*, in regard that this inspiration within could be discernable to himself onely; and so the text and context, and the whole chapter shall be made to agree throughour, one verse with another. Nevertheless there is one inconvenience this interpretation is liable to, as will make it to be refused by most men, when we have said all we can. It is this, that if this be the meaning, then must this whole place be applicable onely to those Christians, in the Apostles daies, and no Christian at this time can be concerned: That is, if this be the sense, then is there no man now that hath *received the Spirit of God*, that he may know the things of God; no *Spiritual man* now in the true sense of this place, but all must be *natural men* onely, as *having not the Spirit* according to this interpretation; when yet the *giving of the Spirit* otherwhere, and in the sense of other Texts, is a branch of the *New Covenant*; and he that hath not the *Spirit of Christ* (St. Paul saies in another place) is none of his.

There



There is a third Interpretation therefore, that by the *Natural* man and *Spiritual* man we are to understand the *Unregenerate* and *Regenerate* man, that is, one that hath not, and one that hath *received the Spirit* to the ordinary effects of it, which is illumination and sanctification. And this is the most general Opinion and Interpretation which is received by our Divines, and so taken up by Dr. Owen, however elaborately he hath improved it : so little reason hath this Gentleman, or any others, to make any assault on him for that matter. When the unregenerate man then in the Text is said not *receive the things of the Spirit*, or Doctrines of Christ, and that he *cannot* (that is, morally cannot) receive them; the meaning of our Divines in general is this, that he does not, or cannot receive or discern them so as to *savour* them, or *relish* them; he does not, or cannot embrace them in his heart, as good to him, or so, as to lead his life according to them. In short, he cannot receive them so as to *apply* them. And this is a Truth never to be gainsaid by this man; though which of the three Interpretations is to be preferred, I pass not my own judgment.

Let us hear this Authour's Objections. The Doctor (saies he) does grant that an unregenerate man may *assent* to the truth of the things of God; and if he can assent to them, he can see a conformity in them to God's Attributes, and a suitableness to the ends of the Gospel; and if he can see this, then will they not appear *foolishness to him*; and consequently he *can know them*. Every one will answer to this. There is a *Speculative* and a *Practical* knowledge.

B.

When

When our Divines say, the unregenerate man cannot know these things, they understand it of a *Practical* knowledge; he does know them *speculatively*, but he hath no *vital, experimental* knowledge of them: And when the reason is given in the Text, because they are *spiritually discerned*, we must expound *spiritually, i. e.* by the assistance of God's Spirit, according to this third Interpretation. The *Natural* man does not receive, know, or discern these *things of God*, as able (I account) to *apply* them, because they are discerned onely by a *supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost*; which they, having not, cannot do it. I will answer farther. The Spirit may be given and received to divers effects; either for illumination and conviction, or for conversion and sanctification. If the *Natural* man, who is one without the Spirit, hath not the Spirit at all to *illuminate* and *convince* him, he *believes* not the Doctrines of Christ, though he *hears* them. *There is no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost*; and while he in his heart *believes* them not, they are indeed to him but *foolishness*; when if he hath the Spirit but to *enlighten* and to *convince* him, he may dogmatically receive them, going so far; and yet until he hath the Spirit also to *convert* him and *sanctify* him, he cannot *discern* them (I must still say) so, as to *apply* them to his *salvation*.

Here are three Interpretations then proposed to them who please to strive for mastery: I have but one Note more to add out of this Authour. *By being spiritually discerned* (saies he, speaking of *these things* in the Text) *is meant their being known, understood,*  
and



and judged of by the revelation and testimony of the Spirit. Thus much is right, and must be agreed upon by all three Interpretations; onely their difference then also must be laid down. This *revelation* or *testimony* of the Spirit therefore, is either *external*, or *internal*. The first Opinion (which is this Author's) will have this revelation *external*, and so shall he that hath the *Scriptures* onely, be accounted to have the Spirit, and to discern these spiritual things. The other two Opinions will have this testimony or revelation *internal*; so that without the Spirit's operation *within*, the man is to be held a *Natural man*, and not to understand *these things*. This *internal* revelation of the Spirit then, is either *extraordinary* in the miraculous gifts and discernment of the *Primitive* times; and the second Opinion is, that the place is to be understood of these gifts, and such workings of the Spirit as do not belong now to *ours*: or it is *ordinary* in the work of illumination and conversion, which still continue in the world: and the third Opinion (which is the Drs.) rests in this, as of most concern to us, and most easie of admission.

There is a fourth Interpretation. By the *αἰσθητικοὶ ψυχικοὶ* may be understood the *Sensual* man; and by the *πνευματικοὶ*, the *intellectual* contemplative man. The Platonists do distinguish their *αἰσθητικὸν* & *ψυχικόν*, and some of our Platonical Divines do favour this Exposition. To confirm it, there is that Text in *Jude* may be produced, where the *ψυχικοὶ* are so translated, *sensual, not having the Spirit*, with other places where *σάρκατοι* & *πνευματικοὶ* are opposed. This Note by the way I take up however, that *ψυχικὸς* & *τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχων*, are indeed

the same : But this interpretation I think too extremely opposite to the first, which is our Authors; for these mens *spiritual man* is no more than his *natural man*; and I am satisfied with him, that no man of the highest attainment by contemplation can be able to find out any of these things in the text which depend on Gods Sovereign Will, and can be discovered only by his Spirit. For, *As no man knoweth the things of a man* (saies the text) *save the spirit of a man which is in him; even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God.* These things of God are (I say) the arbitrary councils of God's will for the saving man by his grace in and through Jesus Christ, which lies not within the scheme of Nature, and come not therefore within the ken of humane understanding; unless they be made known to us either by inspiration of them into our selves, or by the Revelation of them, through the Spirit, by others.

There may be haply more Interpretations than these (for I consult not Commentators) : but if any be apt to mingle the two former into one, for confutation of the third, because it is Dr. *Owens*, I do apprehend such, to betray a precipitate disaffection, rather than a ponderous judgement. I know that the first and second (this Authors, and the Friendly Debaters) may be made use of to confute the third, which is the received interpretation, and the Doctors : but so may the third and second be used to confute this Authors: and yet that will neither make the first and second, nor the second and third to be the same. That interpretation which gives such a sense of the Chapter as makes the *receiving the Spirit*

rit there applicable only to the Christians in the *Primitive times*, cannot be the same with that which gives such a sense of it as makes it applicable to Christians *now*, whether all of them, regenerate and unregenerate who have but their Bibles, as this man will have it, or those only who are partakers of it to the effect of *Regeneration*, according to Dr. Owen.

Let us look the Gentlemans Introduction now again over, and we shall find that the braggery of that Interpretation which he hath advanced to confute Dr. Owen, does lye herein, that every one who hath the Scriptures, and does not reject them, must have *the Spirit* in the Text to *discern the things of God*, and the Doctor must be a very proud man who does number himself among *such*, and will allow the *Regenerate* only to know them. This must be shewn by all means, what an *absurd* person the Doctor is, who will have an *almighty, irresistible, new light* brought into the soul by the Holy Ghost ( that is, a work of illumination on the mind, and conversion on the heart ) to enable a man to *discern these things*, when by *the Spirit* according to him we are to understand the outward revelation of the Word only, which all have, to enable them to discern the same.

There is one notion for all this, which is much inculcated by him, that seems to verge upon a mixture of the two first Interpretations, by fetching in something from the second into his, which upon the account of corroborating, is but some confounding himself first, for confutation of the Doctor. *The Apostle* ( saies he ) *proposes the demonstration of the Spirit, and of power to judge of the truth of the Gospel; and*

he also proposeth the comparing *spiritual things with spiritual* to judge of the sense of the *Doctrines* of it. Again, *Things that are spiritually discerned* are those which be discernable only by the revelation of the Spirit. That is, by the testimony of the Spirit in miracles as to the truth of them, and by comparing one divine revelation with another, as to the meaning of them. I love the Author for this, because, I must confess, it seems to me to be very neatly spoken; and yet it is but a tale when he hath said it. The Apostle distinguishes not the *truth* of the *things* of God in the Text and the *meaning* of them. 'Tis he makes the distinction, and puts it on the Apostle, as if he intended that which came not once into his mind: Nor does the Apostle propose these two ways of *discerning things spiritually*, but himself proposes them. I do not think the Apostle to be so double minded as to understand two things by this one expression, *spiritually discerned*. If he intended by it that the *truth* of the things revealed was *discerned* by the testimony of the Spirit given thereunto by *miracles*, he intended not by it that the *meaning* of them is discerned by the testimony of *Scripture*. And *e contra*, if he intended the later, he meant not the former. The Apostle, I believe, had but one meaning, though these two things be true asunder. There is no man can be sure that by the *demonstration of the Spirit* in this Chapter, and the *comparing spiritual things with spiritual*, the Apostle intended two things, or two wayes of that Spirit's testimony: it is more likely that the later expression does *de industria* expound the former. To wit, that when we find out any

any truth or doctrine by comparing one Scripture with another, this is the *demonstration of the Spirit* intended in the place ; which I shall have occasion to suppose again by and by, in regard to another Writer. If they are *two* sorts of testimony, no man can be sure that he intended them both ( I say still ) by that *one* explanation. And who can tell moreover whether the Apostle meant, by his *comparing spiritual things with spiritual*, the comparing one *inspiration* with another ( which belongs to the second ) : or one *Scripture* with another, that is the revelations of the *New* with those of the *Old Testament* ( which is proper to the first interpretation ). The man who had a Revelation within must have the *truth* of it and *meaning* both confirmed to him by that inspiration, so that to distinguish of the *truth* and *meaning* of a doctrine inspired ( that is as to such ) is certainly of no signification : And as for those who judge of any doctrine by the Scriptures, they are but rightly to understand the *meaning*, and they have the *truth* by that understanding. Where the Revelation or Doctrine is divine, the *truth* and *meaning* are one another. As for the confirmation of Christianity by miracles, and more particularly by the effusion of Gifts in the Primitive times, it does not belong to this Author's, but the second interpretation.

And from hence arises another objection against the Doctor, It is from the *demonstration of the Spirit* we read of in the fourth verse, by which, this quick Divine ( I suppose ) after the famous Author of that book entituled the *Friendly Debate*, does understand the miraculous operation of the Spirit in those

those times. When the Apostle preached the Gospel at first, the *Holy Ghost* fell on the hearers, and they spake with tongues, understood mysteries, and could do miracles. This was an undeniable testimony to the divinity of their Doctrine, so that no man can Preach (out of doubt) with such *demonstration* now in our dayes. If this then be the meaning of the *Spirit* in that verse, it must be the meaning of it in the verses following (that is to judge tightly, and the defect of this ready man is here, that he hit not on our intimation before). Consequently, as this *demonstration of the Spirit* (if it be so) is by those miraculous gifts: the *receiving* the Spirit there must be *in those gifts*, and particularly the gift of discerning, so the spiritual man must be him that *had* that gift, the Natural man him that had it *not*, whereby the one could *judge of all things* (that is, those things in the Text), the other could not *know them*, upon that account. And this is both against the Authors, and the Doctors interpretation. The Doctor understands the Text so as no man can *discern the things of God spiritually*, unless he be regenerate: this Gentleman to oppose this, will have all understanding Christians be able to understand them *spiritually*, because they have the revelation of the spirit in the Scriptures (and why not *demonstrate* them so by the Spirit likewise); And yet is he unhappily lead (I apprehend by the Friendly Debater) to give such an exposition of one of the verses of this Chapter, as the rest being carried on accordingly, his own interpretation and the Doctors both are quite gone: That is, when this ingenious man hath offered so handson  
a sense



a *sense* of this Text as to render the place gratefully applicable to all Christians, and in so much larger a capacity than the Doctor (as the unregenerate are more than the regenerate) he does by one inadvertant leading concession fall into *theirs*, as does make this place proper only to the primitive times. Such need have they who are too forward in charging others with inconsistencies, to look to themselves, that their own writings be consistent, with a mature judgement, and the fear of God, in doing *to* others as they would be done *to by* others.

I will therefore now turn to some words of the Friendly Debater himself, and in the mean time make this stand. The revelation which a man hath from *without*, and the understanding accordingly this *receiving the Spirit* by having the Scriptures, and judging all things by them, is *one* thing : and the revelation which he hath from *within*, and understanding the *receiving the Spirit* by the miraculous gift of discernment, by which he judges of these things, so as indeed he can be *judged of none*, is *another*. Either let this Author cleave to his own Exposition, and forsake the other ; or let him forsake his own, and cleave to the other. And hereby shall all arguments gathered from this place of Scripture, about any point in dispute in our *Dayes* (such as are the doctrines of free grace, and free will, and of the subject of this Authors Book, (the operations of the holy Spirit) be laid to sleep, and give us no trouble.

The words I mean of the *Friendly Debate*, are these, because they afford us some farther necessary matter.

*The Assembly of Divines when they direct men how to perform their Ministry doe not speak so in their Directory as to be understood; since they cannot prophesie, nor speak with tongues, nor demonstrate their doctrine by miracles, as the Apostles did. I would gladly know what they mean by delivering the truth in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power; I am apt to think it would puzzle a new Assembly to tell us in plain words what they intended by that phrase. Let me desire you not to use words without sense belonging to them, and to entreat your Minister that he would hereafter forbear to pray to God, he may speak so as no body now can hope to do. I wonder at you, that you should not discern the Apostle speaks there of the wonderful work of the Holy Ghost. I doubt your Minister is not enlightened, because he doth not instruct you better in the Scripture.*

I do not here dislike this liberty of conception in so well-studied an Interpreter of Scripture as I take that Writer to be, that when the Apostle speaks of his own Preaching in the *demonstration of the Spirit and of power* he accounts it to be understood of that confirmation of the Christian Doctrine by the miraculous gifts as was in those times: yet when he proceeds to so universal an adventure as to forbid every Minister to use that expression henceforward any more in his prayer, the singularity offends.

In the Liturgy we have these words in a prayer. *Almighty God who alone workest great miracles, send down upon our Bishops and Curates the helpful Spirit of thy grace.* This expression does allude to the mission



mission of the Holy Ghost at first on the Apostles, when there *appeared cloven tongues and sat on each of them*; and the Church does pray here in this sense, that God who wrought that great *marvel* on the Apostles in sending down his Spirit and gifts at first, in that extraordinary manner and way as he did upon them for fitting them for their Office, would be pleased to vouchsafe the grace and gifts of the same Spirit on our present Ministers (whether superiour or inferiour) in that *ordinary* manner and measure still, as is fit for such as do succeed them in that great employment. I may presume (I doubt not) to say the same here, that suppose the Apostles Preaching in the *demonstration of the Spirit and of power* to lye only in those miraculous gifts or effects of the Holy Ghost now ceased, the Minister while he prayes to God for his blessing that he may preach so, is to be understood in the like allusion and meaning: to wit, that as God enabled the Apostles in their time to speak in the *demonstration of the Spirit and of power*, whatsoever that was; so he would assist him in such a way and manner now as is but suitable to the present work and his ordinary operation.

Thus much I say upon supposition of our second, and this *Debaters* Interpretation: but I must confess I do not find my self convinced in the reading the Text, that this interpretation is indubitable. I offer these reasons (at least for Dr. *Owens*, and his Antagonists sake) from the place against it.

1. I see not any thing that will restrain our sense on necessity to that meaning, and we are not to be narrow in our allowances to the thoughts of others,

who keep to the analogy of faith without cogent reason.

2. The *demonstratiin of the Spirit and of power* is opposed to the *excellency of speech*, or *enticing words of mans wisdom*. But the Apostles speaking with tongues or his miraculous gifts does not oppose the eloquence of man or excellency of words, but rather agree with it. That which does in the most direct sense oppose the excellency of speech and enticing words of mans wisdom, is plain truth which the Spirit teaches.

3. The Apostle proceeding on in the Chapter speaks not of himself only, but of the whole Church. *Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things which are freely given to us of God.* That which all the faithful do know by the Spirit as well as the Apostles, cannot be miraculous or extraordinary. Such is the demonstration here. Or thus, That which is *common* to all the faithful, and not *peculiar* to the *Apostles* and *primitive* times, or to any *particular* person, cannot be miraculous or extraordinary. Such is the *receiving the Spirit* here, and consequently the *demonstration* of it.

4. Those things the Holy Ghost teaches a man by comparing one thing with another, as spiritual things with Spirituall, which is by way of study and discursive reason, are not demonstrated in a way miraculous and extraordinary, belonging only to the Apostles and not other Ministers of Christ: But such was the Apostles speaking here, *Which things also we speak, not in the words which mans wisdom teacheth, but*  
*which*

which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing *spiritual* things with *spiritual*.

5. The following comparison between the *natural* man and the *spiritual* man, that one receives or relishes not the things of God as disagreeing to his judgement, and the other does, seems more aptly to be understood as it is ordinarily of the regenerate and unregenerate, than of the extraordinarily inspired only, unto which this most curious Interpreters thoughts must lead him.

6. In the last place, I humbly offer an interpretation of this expression, which if it be not the very meaning of the Text, as much of that which is urged here seems to attest : yet will it be sufficient (I hope ) to justify our Prelates, Universities, Doctors, with the most of the Ministers of the Church, as well as the *Assembly* , and the more plain and honest meaning Country-Preachers in their using the same so ordinarily as they do in their prayers. It is this :

To speak in the *demonstration* of  
the *Spirit* is to deliver the ve-  
ry truth of Scripture, or the  
plain sense of the Spirit in  
Scripture , in opposition to  
humane conceit or invention:  
and to speak so is to speak

in Power, because a man may expect that assistance of the Holy Ghost to accompany such Preaching which he cannot upon other.

*The Preaching of the Cross is to them that perish foolishness, but unto us which are saved it is the power of God. I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes. It received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth the word of God. The receiving the word as the word of God and not of man, is the receiving it in power, and the preaching it accordingly so, is the preaching it in power; and what that power is does follow, Which effectually worketh in you that believe. Our Gospel came unto you not in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Ghost. This is my Covenant with them, My Spirit which is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, and of thy seed, for ever.*

## C H A P. II.

*Of the Substance or Contents of the Authors four first Chapters, wherein I make my self concerned but little farther.*

**I** Return to the Doctors Opposer, and I come now from his Introduction to his Book. Of this Book there are two parts. The first is to shew us what the Scriptures hold forth concerning the Spirits operations. The second is to confute many *pernicious* Doctrines of Dr. Owen. The first and second both is indeed to do this : but the second shall do it all together. And this part he hath *reserved*, I suppose, to come out hereafter.

The first part then having this subject, The Spirits Operations, does contain seven Chapters.

In his first Chapter he explains to us what he means by the *Spirit*, and by its *Operations*. The word *Spirit* (saies he) signifies three things. The *Mind*, the *Temper of the mind*, the *Holy Ghost*, and he understands it of the last. I have two things to say here. The one is, as to his second signification : The temper or disposition of the Mind, is either of *Nature* only, and belongs to the *Spirit of man* within him ; or of *Grace*, and belongs to the *Spirit of God*, that works it. Of this Temper, the Author must be understood to speak, when he speaks of the Spirit of *Faith*, *Fear* and *Love*. The other is, that there are more significations of the word *Spirit* than these, which himself knows. *Every spirit which confesseth*

seth Christ, in John, is ( I think ) as much as *every Doctrine*. Which by the way does put me in mind to say thus much, that when this Author comes to speak of things which are common heads, and only require a grave and comprehensive Divine to marshal them, he does methinks appear to me so lank, as I cannot tell well whether that which he saies be *solid* or no, because I am sure it is not *full*: though when he falls upon several particular things, he seems to look through them well. By the *operations* of the Spirit he understands ( and defines them ) *those which are on the mind, to cause certain qualities, promised in the Gospel, and continued in all ages*. I have two things therefore to say here likewise. One is, that though this were never so much too short, there is no body in the main of what is said, is like to contradict him. Dr. Owen by the *Spirit* understands the *Holy Ghost*, as he does; and by the *Operations* of it, what he does. And why then will he fall foul on the Dr.? When he agrees with him in the substance, what need is there he should *pursue a flea* in the circumstances of words only, or variety of expression? Another is, that where he excepts at the Doctor for alluding in his words to some Texts that speak of miraculous gifts, and so cannot be applied to us, and also for a critical note ( he has before ) on the Hebrew word [ *put on him* ] *Isa. 42. 1.* from whence he collects that in Gods giving us the effects of his Spirit, the Spirit it self is also given, I will compound with this Author. The Doctor shall submit his critical note to the Spirit of the Prophets, and this man shall let the Doctor speak but the same things



things by way of allusion to Scripture (whether they be proved thereby or not), which other Divines do speak and affirm ordinarily without that allusion.

In his second Chapter he shews us *what these effects are, for the producing of which, the holy Spirit is given*; which he undertakes to do here from that Text, *Luke 11. 13.* where, After two parables of the man asking *three Loaves* for his Friend, and of a Son asking *Bread* of a Father, our Saviour tells us, that *God will give his holy Spirit to those that ask him.* From hence he gathers that the effects for which God gives his Spirit are such as are *needful*, because it is *Bread* the Son and the Friend asks: and *profitable*, because a *Fish* and *Egg* also is given. Here he tells, that our need is to be measured by the end; That the end is our salvation. Consequently, the Spirits operations on the mind are to produce all those effects as are necessary to eternal life. These are Faith, Knowledge; All Vertue or graces which make us practical Christians; and Perseverance. Here are his *needful* effects: then his *profitable*, and not *necessary*, are degrees of Goodness, which are more highly so; or degrees of Knowledge, that are less profitable. Here he discourses whether God does give the Spirit for these things *profitable* upon our asking; and tells us, God may give us things better or more suitable, and so deny them. Then he shews us how the Spirit is prayed for in the Lords prayer, because when we ask for any grace or vertue, we ask for him to work it. In the whole then of this Chapter we have nothing against the Doctor, or

the Doctor against him, but a good Sermon I suppose we have, which he might have preached somewhere, and adapts it to this occasion ; which makes it look ( though well, yet ) feat, and unlike a beaten Divine ; who in shewing what the effects of Gods Spirit are, would have cast them into some proper and fuller order, and then proved them by Scripture, and quite let alone this Sermon.

His third Chapter is about *Regeneration*, which he makes room for by an Objection, that this will be thought but a *lame account* of those qualifications that are needful to salvation. seeing one thing most necessary thereunto is omitted, and that is *Regeneration*. And here then must *Regeneration* be brought in and shewn us, that it is not such a thing as Dr. Owen makes it, but is comprized in his Moral graces and vertues. *Regeneration* then as a *state* ( he defines it ) *is to become a sincere Disciple of Jesus Christ*. And here, though one might well require a little more accuracy in a definition, there is no body like to differ with him upon the matter. The Doctor may use other terms and expressions, and he uses these, but they both intend the same thing. This is certain, *He that doth righteousness is born of God*. The Doctor belike hath said, that *Regeneration* is a *proper Term*, and he will prove it to be *metaphorical*. Be it so. The Doctor must be candidly understood then, that he means, it is a *proper metaphor*. To wit, that there is such a secret and powerful work of the soul signified thereby, as does bring in a new disposition into the *inner man*, as well  
as



as reforms the outward life, which is, that only in effect he contends for. *Let them grant* (saies the Doctor) *that their Moral reformation of life does proceed from a Spiritual reformation of our nature, the difference will be at an end.* And what saies this Author? He answers. *This difference is at an end before it began, for we have alwaies granted it.* And why is the difference up then, that hath no beginning or cause for it? The Doctor is perhaps too warm in the *allusion*, but the meaning is acknowledged the same with his, who is as it were quite cool and off from it. There is indeed one point as to the *manner* of the Spirits operation, wherein these two Champions will differ, but that belongs to another Chapter. Here he speaks of Regeneration only as a *state*, and therefore I pray let him be quiet yet a while, till he comes thither.

In his fourth Chapter he laies down the *several* *graces of the holy Spirit*; which having done *once* before, I cannot apprehend it to be momentous in his making *two* Chapters of it. These graces then again are Faith, Teachableness in order to it, All Christian vertues, The improvement of them, Progress in them, Perseverance to the end. To this we oppose nothing, and there is no dissention with the Doctor. The Doctor (or another) perhaps would have marshalled these things otherwise: but that all these are the operations of Gods Spirit, or such effects for which the Holy Ghost is to be implored, is beyond dispute amongst us. What he hath thrust in here upon that subject of Gods dwelling in

good men, I take to be another excellent good Sermon.

---

### C H A P. III.

*Of Assurance and praying by the Spirit (the Subject of his fifth Chapter) with indifferency whether it be by a Form, or conceived Prayer.*

**I** Come to his fifth Chapter, which is to shew us what effects we are *not* to expect from the Spirit, having shewn before what effects (as he reckons them) are promised by it. And there are three *pretended gifts* (he saies) which are none of these effects, and so may not be hoped or prayed for upon that account. *Immediate Revelation of the sense of any Scripture; Absolute assurance of our particular election; and the dictates of Extempore prayer.*

These are three things belike he designs to have a fling at, which he may do, but I must tell him in the way (whether any thing of this kind may be expected from the holy Spirit or not) I am not satisfied with his argument, or the way of his bringing it about, that the effects for which we are to pray to God to give us his Spirit, are only things needful, and therefore we may not expect his help in extemporary prayer, and these two other matters. This indeed may be argued from the Parables in the context, that the gift it self of the Spirit is a thing needful. A gift which next to Gods giving his Son is the greatest and most necessary to mankind; for as  
Christ

Christ was given for our *Redemption*, the Spirit is, and must be given for the *Application*. But that the effects of the Spirit being given should be confined by him to these only he mentions, or such only as he can fetch Scripture for (unless he could bring Scripture also to say there are no more), is such reasoning as before a year is gone over his head, may give him occasion to believe that some things may seem strong in a Sermon, that are not fit for a Book that must undergo a discussion.

I do not think he hath spoken this as a *close Polemical Divine*, nor yet that he hath laid down the method of those benefits which we have from the Holy Spirit, as a *Comprehensive Preacher*: For when the Holy Ghost is not only our *Sanctifier*, but *Comforter*, and promised and sent to the Church as *the Comforter*, it is strange that the *Consolations of the Spirit* should be left out in the draught of those effects, which we are to expect from him. And when the Spirit is first given to a man to *unite* him to Christ, and this *Union* is the primary effect of his having it, and by means hereof, all saving influences from the *Head* is derived: this by another would not have been forgotten.

The Holy Ghost is given (I count) for our *Sanctifier*, our *Comforter*, and our *Guide*. Regeneration is to be comprehended in Sanctification, as the beginning of it, and Union is supposed to both. I cannot serve God without his grace, I must therefore have the Spirit to *Sanctify* me. If I serve him, I must be supported in his service, I must therefore have him to *Comfort* me. When I am supported in my

duty, I know not what uncertainties may befall me in all my spiritual and temporal concerns in this life, and therefore I must have him to *Conduct* me, and *lead* me in all my affairs, so as they may work together for the best, which he hath promised to those that *love him*. Under this head now of the Spirits heavenly *Guidance*, are all those things that are good for us, and not absolutely *necessary*, to be reduced; seeing *we know not what to pray for as we ought* (as we shall have occasion farther to speak of that Text by and by) *but the Spirit helpeth us*, that is, we know not in many things (*temporal*, says this Author, and I will say in *spirituals* too) what is best for us: and it is the Spirit that is our *Guide* as to these things, and *Intercessor* for them: so that, be it the true Sense of a place of Scripture, or Assurance, or assistance of us in our Prayers, or any thing else that we would have, we are, under the safe conduct of his word, and unperceptible motions, and with the resignation of our wills unto him, (as our great disposer for all good), to set our selves to our duty, and leave the issue to him. I will add, it were better that this man never wrote this Book, than that in the promise of God's giving his Spirit to us, we should be discouraged from praying to him, and trusting in him, for our direction in all the concerns of our souls, and outward conditions; who is the Comforter of the afflicted, the Sanctifier of all the faithful, and *our Guide unto death*.

To his three things now in order.

For the first of them, it is manifest, that in the Primitive times one of the miraculous gifts then given,  
was

was the gift of *Interpretation*; and there is no body that I know does pretend to any of these wonderful gifts in our days. I am sure this Author cannot charge any thing of this kind upon Doctor *Owen*, who is a person of that industry and learning, as his excellency in this gift is well known to come another way. As for these arguments then, that the thing is not *needful*; and if *profitable*, that it is *more profitable* to our *selves*, and to *others*, to get the sense of any Scripture by enquiry and study, than by immediate Revelation (which if we could have it so, is as certainly false, as that *Gold* is not so good as *Brass*) they may be spared, seeing there need no proof of this, that we are now to expect no Miracles from the Spirit of God.

For the second, there are two points about Assurance, which this Author does confound; The one is, the assurance that a man is in a state of Grace; and the other, an assurance of Salvation. That a man who is in a state of Grace can never fall away finally and perish (which is the Doctrine of Perseverance), is a point of the Synod of *Dort* against the Arminians and Lutherans. Whether a man may be assured that he is in a state of Grace or no, is a Point between Protestants and Papists? For the former, Perseverance depends on special Grace; and that on personal Election; and I perceive this Gentleman hangs his head at that: but as for the latter, we may be in doubt what indeed his mind is. One would think by his arguments at the beginning against Assurance, he should be no Protestant, but he is; for we have his express words for it, *If we be the Children of God, it is certainly*

tainly possible for us to be assured of it. I must ask him then, is Assurance a good thing? St Paul had it, and St. John had it, *Hereby we know we are passed from death to life,*—and, *By this we know, that we know him*—If it be a thing then that is good, it must be an effect of God's Spirit: and this is proved, *The Spirit also beareth witness with our spirits*—This witness is our Assurance, and consequently it may be prayed for according to the promise in *Luke*, as well as any other of the *profitable* effects he hath mentioned. Whether it be a thing *needful*, is a question not needful, so long as it is *good*. It is an *Egg*, I hope, to argue with him, though it be not *Bread*. The only difficulty here is, to state this Assurance. It is a controversial point, and his one term *Absolute* will do little to the decision. When our first Divines defined Faith by a *Persuasion of special mercy*, so that without this assurance, they must think a man could not be saved, this was the most dangerous extreme on one hand: and that no man at all without Revelation (according to the *Trent Doctors*) can be assured that he is in God's favour, is the extreme on the other. But for the stating this assurance aright, between the Protestant and Papist, To be a *certainty* not of *Faith*, because the Scripture gives no testimony to any particular person, but a *certainty moral* (or of *hope*), which must be such as excludes *doubting*, that is, all sinful doubting, though not *fear*, or all fear that is, the *fear of diffidence* or distrust, but not the *fear of pious solicitude*, is a work requires from me more deliberation, and more paper. This I will say only, that there is a *neutral truth* in the most of these

Con-



Controversies that must be found out, in regard both to *Practise* as well as *Theory*, or we shall neither have our *Consciences* nor *Judgments* well pacified in these matters.

For the third thing then I will take a little more room; for, as I have had, and took an occasion before, to speak of Preaching by the Spirit, or with the *demonstration of it*; so I think it also seasonable; futable, and profitable to speak of praying by the Spirit, unto which this Author himself, and much more the *Friendly Debater*, hath given such ample opportunity, I wish I might not call it, in regard to many good devout Christians, *provocation*. There is one Text therefore in regard to this matter, as there was one in regard to the other, that requires our more serious consideration. It is, *Rom. 8. 26, 27. Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit it self maketh intercession for us, with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts, knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the Saints, according to the will of God.*

The Apostle speaking in the eighteenth Verse before the Text, and in the twenty eight after it, about the afflictions of this life, which God's Children endure, whereby they are conformed to Christ in sufferings, as they shall be in glory, this ingenious Author does apprehend that the exposition of these words is to be confined to that matter altogether. *We know not what to pray for as we ought*, That is, we know not what is best for us in this mortal life, in

regard to these troubles, persecutions, or miseries, whereby God intends sometimes to do us much good; and we are therefore to seek to him with submission to his will in these things; having this encouragement in our hearts, that the Spirit of God is our *Guide* (as I said before, where this Author left it out) to direct us under all these Providences, and to be our *Intercessor* also to obtain for us that which is like to prove best. He knows what that is, and stirs up in our souls many earnest desires after it; which, seeing we cannot reach our selves, these desires cannot be uttered by us; that is, are *unutterable* on that account; but so long as our requests are put up by him in those desires, God, who *knows the mind of his own Spirit*, hears these petitions, and grants those very things which are best; that is, which *he means*: so that these things do, and shall certainly work together for our good, as the Apostle says in the place, so long as we *love* him,

This is in length the contents of that interpretation (and I suppose, according to his mind) which he hath sedulously proposed, both with authority and dexterity enough, if he were but as tender withal of preserving that support and warrantable expectation from the Holy Spirit, which we have ground to take up in this place. I like well, of all that is expressed in regard to afflictions, unto the illustration of which sense the Apostles own example (in his praying himself to have his troubles, the *thorn in the flesh*, removed, and God's seeing it best for him, rather to afford him his *sufficient Grace*) does opportunely conduce: but I do not approve by no means the flaking



king down the interpretation of these words to that matter only. And much less will I give way to Doctor *Hammond's* translating the word *disceps*, *Misery*: for seeing there is twenty places perhaps where the word is taken in this sense, *Infirmity*, to one where it is taken in the other for *Affliction*; I must hold it but right to give it here (according to our Translations, English and Latin) its ordinary and genuine signification.

There is a great deal of comfort in these dear words of the Text, that *the Spirit helps our infirmities*. We are sensible with how many of them we are encompassed, not in regard to the things without us, so much as within us: and if the weaknesses, frailty, shortnesses, imperfections, of our natures, persons, abilities, tempers, conditions, be not provided for by the Divine succor, we are undone. I look upon the man that will go to take away from me the comfort of these words, and this place, in regard to my addresses unto God, as him that is coming to pick my Lock, and take away my Treasure. I will not suffer this man to rob me of my trust, in the conduct and assistance of God's gracious good Spirit, in the very making and pouring out my Prayers for all the good that he and Doctor *Hammond* can do me with both their Books. I do hate to put the name of *Formal* men, or *Formalists* on any party; yet seeing some of all parties are such, I cannot but declare that man to be a *Formalist* to me, who shall offer to speak the least thing wilfully to damp the prayers of any the humblest ones, or weakest ones, in whom the Spirit of God does dwell.

There is another interpretation then of these words, and of the matter intended in them, that will carry it, I think from the former. The word *Likewise* which ushers in the Text will carry it. When I consider the Context, the words in Verse 28. following the Text does almost persuade me that the matter this Author hath proposed, may be intended; and I am pleased that it is likely; but the word *Likewise* doth import plainly, that the matter intended must relate to the words before, and not to those that follow; and they carry it (I say) otherwise. The Apostle therefore in this Chapter speaking of Gods Children, and thinking presently of the evils they endure, does, for our support upon that account, fall to telling us of the freedom we shall have in another state; in comparison whereof, these things deserve not *any reckoning*. This is in Verse 11. Of this state then in the verses following he treats, as that which is expected of all the *Creatures*, and by *Us*, a state of liberty and glory, which we hope for, though we *see it not*, and with *patience wait for it*, in the Verses immediately foregoing. And then in this Text it follows, that likewise we also through the Spirit pray for it. *Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities*: Mark it, *likewise*, and *also*. This must hold the same matter together in this, and the former Verses. *For we know not what we should pray for as we ought*. What is that then, but we are not able in this life to comprehend any thing to purpose of that state of glorious liberty whereof he was speaking. *We know not what we shall be*, says St. John, *but we shall be like him*. Things there be that are *prepared for us*,  
but.

but what they are, neither hath the *eye seen*, nor *ear heard*, nor can the *heart conceive* truly of these things, which yet we *hope* for, and so *pray* for, the Spirit exciting these desires in us who knows them, & makes *intercession* by these *groans* or desires which are *unutterable*, both in regard to our selves in that we know not the things of Heaven, and cannot utter them; and in regard to the nature of the things which are expressly called by the Apostle when he was ravished in his Spirit up thither to see them, *ἀρρητὰ ῥηματα*, *things not possible to be uttered*: And yet are they prepared for us, though above our comprehension; and God who does *above what we are able to ask or think*, and knows what is the *mind of his own Spirit*, will grant them; because this *Intercession* is by his *appointment*, and we are to support our hearts, that this time is coming, when not only all these miseries shall have an end, but we shall see Gods *end* in them all, in making them work for us, a *far more exceeding weight of Glory*.

Here are two interpretations then which I leave to the Reader; and he perhaps may choose neither of them: but in both of them that objection which is obvious from the Lord's Prayer is prevented. Christ hath taught us what we are to pray for, and yet does the Text tell us that we know not *what we should pray for as we ought*. There are things in the Lord's Prayer which we are to pray for, and know that we ought to pray for them, and do pray for them; yet do we know them but *in part*; and we are more short in our knowing how to pray for them, as *best* for us. When we pray for *deliverance from evil*, and

*temptation*, that includes our present troubles ; and these are the things *we know not* , according to the *first* Interpretation. When we pray that God's *Kingdom may come* , that includes the things of heaven ; and these are the things *we know not* , according to the *second* Interpretation. That which cannot be denied in regard to these two Petitions , must be acknowledged in all others under a like condition. There is little reason for this Author then to pick a quarrel with Doctor *Owen* for attributing too much to the assistance of God's Spirit , in the making our Prayers (who is so very cautious to allow any thing but in regard to the *matter* of them) when there is so much more included here in the Spirits praying for us, and that for the things *we know not* ; as it may make any man at a stand who goes about to limit the Holy One almost at all, for fear of presuming on the *Ark* of his imperceptible operations.

Having said this , I have but three or four notes more upon this Text, which must not be waved. It is to be considered first , we have the Spirit put here into the Office of Intercessor , and there is a practical case requires satisfaction. Christ hath promised again and again, that *whatsoever we ask by Faith in his name , according to his will , we shall have it*. There is many a good man now troubled at this, that he hath prayed often, and not been heard. It must be answered therefore upon this account, that whatsoever request we make , or any one makes , with the qualifications exprest , it is, and must be put up to God by the Holy Spirit ; and though it be not answered according to *our mind*, it is according to *his*, who

who maketh intercession for us. A second note is this, that though the Apostle be supposed to bring in these words, [*We know not what we should pray for as we ought*] with regard to the Context, it will not follow from the *instance* of one or other of these *particular* matters to be *intended*, that all others must be *excluded*; but rather, that the *universal* matters of Prayer, so far as they are subject to the like condition, must be certainly also *concluded*. Note in the third place, that though there does appear some reason from the objection mentioned, for limiting these words, [*We know not what to pray for*] there is no reason for limitation of the first part of the Text [*The Spirit helpeth our infirmities.*] For when it is affirmed that it is by reason of our infirmity that we know not what to pray for, it does not follow that therefore that is *all* our infirmity. We have many more infirmities to be helped than this, in making our Prayers. Note in the last place, that though the *groans unutterable* in the Text be expounded in both these interpretations, with regard to the *matter* *prayed for*, they may very likely be better expounded with regard to these *infirmities*, to be *helped*: that is, though we are such (many of us) as are so weak that we cannot utter our requests, or frame our desires into petitions; yet by the Spirit we are assisted some way, to put these small *unutterable* groans with his *good motions* together, so as they are *accepted* in Heaven. It is not by reason of the *intensiveness* or *greatness*, but because of their *smallness* (said Master Perkins) that these groans are *unutterable*.

I do not think therefore that it is in this Authors power to divert that favour which this Text does cast upon those Prayers which he calls *ex tempore*, the Ancients *ex pectore*; seeing such Prayers do follow, or flow most genuinely from the motions that are upon the soul; and which, so long as they are good, we are to ascribe to the Holy Spirit. And when this is granted on all hands, that he does *excite our affections*, who is there can say, what influence, or how much, that work alone hath, or must have, on our *expressions*? *The Holy Spirit being intimate to our souls, can affect us when we are not sensible of it, and produce effects upon our minds in that manner as if they were meerly the effects of our own reasoning*, says this very Author. And why then do such able and good men (for such I hope they indeed are, and that they do not speak what they do, as *Scoffers*) let such *Discourses* and *Debates* as these come from them which carry a tendency in them to repress that devotion, that has in it, or pretends at least, the most of warmth and enlargement of affection in this duty, as if a *coldness* or *beadishness* in the performance was to be preferred as more safe and wise, when Christ that hath taught us to *pray*, does also exhort us to *fergency* and *importunity*? I cannot tell what they would have by it, unless it be that all should come in to the Liturgy, or else they should have no other Prayers. But this is more than can be expected in conscience. The circumstances of praying in a *Book*, or *without*, is not so material as that they should be so earnest. I am a profest Neuter against extremes, and will apply that saying of the Apostle, *If we be besides*



*besides our selves, it is to Godward; and if we be sober, it is for your cause.* And so having got over this one Text, I will now present you my poor thoughts more closely on this subject, with reference to *Liturgical* and *Extempore* Devotion.

There are four things here therefore to be distinguished and presented. The Spirit of Prayer. The Gift of Prayer. Praying in the Spirit. Praying by it, or with it.

The *Spirit of Prayer* I apprehend to be no other than the Spirit of Grace or Regeneration, with the *connotation* of its operation on the soul, in regard to this duty. There is no Christian born of God without this, whereby he cries *Abba Father*; as no man born after the flesh without his breathing. There is no holy thought, meditation, desire after God, or request that is acceptable to him in Christ, but it is from this Spirit of Adoption or Prayer. It follows then, that forasmuch as any gracious and regenerate man may use a *Form* if he pleases, and some such have used a *Form* sometimes as well as *Conceived Prayer*, that it is a conceit exceedingly extravagant, and in no wise to be approved, to think that a Liturgy or use of a *Form* is inconsistent with the *Spirit of Prayer*. Suppose we saw those holy men, *Bradford, Rogers, Philpot, Saunders*, saying their Prayers out of the Psalter, and blessing God for the Book of King *Edward*. *I will pour upon the house of Judah and Jerusalem the Spirit of Prayer and Supplication.*

The *Gift of Prayer* I account to be a natural or acquired, not infused ability or faculty of expressing the thoughts and affections with fluency or readi-

ness in Prayer. It does depend chiefly I think upon an aptness of memory, retaining the sentences and very words of Scripture, when others can retain the sense only; together with a warm fancy, and a tongue that is voluble. In short, it is a ready utterance, which must be always distinguished from the former. I remember a person, who was otherwise of large parts, filled with all present matter for administering a word in season to the weary, who in praying sometimes alone with me, I have observed to him and he so in his Prayer, that I never heard any so unable to express himself in my life, who yet would use only conceived Prayer; and in the mean while I have been so assured of the Grace of God, and eminency of that Grace in the person, of that sincerity in his duty, such an humbling under sin, fervency in his petitions, melting under the sense of God's mercy and pardon; and in a word, a heart it self no less broken than those words, that I cannot but be satisfied beyond doubt, for ever since, that the *Gift of Prayer* is one thing, and the *Spirit of Prayer* is another.

Now forasmuch as the gifts which are administered to men by God's Spirit, are bestowed for use, and the edification of the Church, if a Liturgy or form of Prayer were imposed on the Clergy in opposition to that provision which God hath made and appointed for the good of his Church, that is, *Gifts unto men for the work of the Ministry*; or if the Bishops would not suffer them to be employed to the end they are given, I do not know any argument of so much weight, and like to be prevailing with Religious people against Common-Prayer as this allegation, *As every*

every one hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold Grace of God. But we must not judge so of our Superiors. The Churches imposing a Liturgy, and set forms on the Minister is to be lookt on as *cumulative* to his gifts, and not as *destructive* to them. There is the gift of Prayer, as of Prudence and Knowledge to Ministers, as they are *single*, and as they are in *conjunction*. These forms of Prayer are the exercise of the mutual gifts of the Churches Pastors in conjunction; and when this *Common Service* of theirs is performed in the *Pew*, the Minister is left to the use of his single gifts in the *Pulpit*, without any prejudicing the one by the other. Indeed, if the Common-Prayer be made a Napkin to wrap up the Talents of any, I will not justify the abuse of that, which hath its use and commendation upon other reasons. And yet by the way, I do not know moreover, whether all those Texts which speak of gifts for the Church, and which argue power thereupon to *profit with them*, are not to be understood of the Spirit in those times; so that when it was manifestly injurious to the Holy Ghost himself *then*, to forbid the use of those Gifts to any, which he had ministred to them to that end: it may not be so altogether, as to those natural gifts and talents that men have *now*; which notwithstanding they are not to be denied to be also from the Spirit, (seeing even *Bezaleel* and his fellows skill in working in curious works, is attributed to him, and every good gift is said to be of God). I question whether the person himself be either so engaged to put them to that *particular* use, having

them from nature to *general* service, or that there does appear the like injury to God and the Church, in some restraint on *them*, as there would be in the *other*. There are *diversity of Gifts, but the same Spirit*.

Praying *in the Spirit* I apprehend to be praying with those qualifications which are wrought in us by the Spirit, and prescribed by him in the word, to make our Prayers acceptable to God. Praying in the Spirit (say Practical Divines) consists not in a copiousness of words, but extent of affections. The actuating of all does lie in the operation of the Spirit on our hearts in this duty. We must pray also *according to God's will*, which is another qualification in Prayer: and when a man does pray according to what the Spirit hath directed in the Word, he may be said very appositely to pray *in the Spirit*.

Two things there are then more particularly, where-in I will place this operation. The one is, the Spirit doth many times pitch the heart upon those objects or things which are most fit for us to ask. The other is, and then doth excite our desires, and enlarge our affections about the same. *The Spirit also helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit it self maketh intercession for the Saints according to the will of God.* I will not doubt to quote this Text again for thus much. It is said that Satan entred into *Judas* when he went to betray his Lord. And Satan moved *David* to number the people. It appears from hence, that Satan puts evil thoughts in the heart, and pitches them on objects he tempts them withal. The Spirit of God doubt-

doubtless does no less in the good actions which he stirs up in Gods Saints, *He puts good thoughts in the mind, and represents things to us* (says the Author of the *Friendly Debate* himself) *more clearly than we could make them by all our reasoning.* I might perhaps cite something from this Gentleman to suite with this, but I think the subject here too grave, to make him my Authority. When the Spirit is said to help us (in the Text before exagitated) to make our Prayers even about things our selves *know not*, and to intercede for us therein according to the *will of God*, it cannot be imagined but thus much must be allowed to that operation, whatsoever farther he does for us. Now then when the Spirit doth not only move the affections in relation to the things the heart is upon in those groanings mentioned to be *unutterable*, but pitches the heart upon these things; those very things or objects themselves (sometimes at least) that are *most suitable to our wants*, which he knows *better than we*: and *most agreeable to God's will*, whether we regard his *promises* and *word*, or the will of his *providence*, and what he is minded to accomplish for us, which he alone *does know, and not we*: it does seem that the prescribing a set form to our prayers does indeed put some stint to one part of this operation (I say it really seems so), which is the suggesting good thoughts, or the good things themselves into our minds, or pitching our hearts upon the things he knows best for every one when the Minister does not know it: though it puts no stint to him in his operation on the affections, exciting or enlarging them after those objects, or the petitions which the Church

hath prescribed. And how far this will go for the preferring of *Conceived Prayer* before a *Form*, I leave to that learned and able Doctor of the Church, and this ingenious person who is following him, to give judgment.

There are many reasons in regard to the Minister, if he hath no Gift, or if he have, and have not grace, least he be puffed up in the ostentation of it, and of the Congregation under some considerations, why a set form is more eligible, when in regard of the humbly godly, who are endowed with the Gift and Spirit both: there is this reason from *praying in the Spirit* to be alledged for *conceived prayer* (I must say, in the Pulpit) out of that Doctors own words before named, as nothing for ought I know, can be put in ballance against it; for notwithstanding the severity of some reflections he hath upon such as are of that mind and practise, I do not see any reason at all why a fluent expression, a raised voice, a zeal in the delivery, a melting soul-touching phrase out of Scripture, with newness and variety of the same, and the like circumstances, which many times pierce the heart that is flat otherwise, and hath need of all we can to quicken it, should any way be derogatory to the sound and wholesome requests otherwise which a man puts up to God in his prayer. And consequently, if such circumstances indeed as these which will raise the affections are incident to *conceived Prayer*, which are not to a *set form*, then hath that worthy Doctor administred an effectual reason why the very same material petitions or confessions of a Prayer are better oftentimes when delivered *ex tempore* than in a *form*,



*form*, and consequently an argument for *one* above the *other*, even while he is seeking occasion hereby to blast conceived Prayer. And why indeed (let me ask) should not the Church be as ready to use those Gifts which God hath given unto any, to excite the people the more in their Devotions, as well as they are to make use of Organs, and diversity of Voices in their choosing Singing-men and Singing-boys to that purpose? The same Psalm in an Anthem hath another operation on the heart of a devout Conformist out of the mouth of a *Choir*, than it hath in a private *Parlour*. And if a Non-conformist does find the like experience as to an *Extempore* Prayer above any *Composure*, why should that Doctor, or this person be any less pleased with it? The use of a man's Gifts in prayer is but an *Organ of God's making*, a warbling, and holy descant upon the plain requests of the heart, to affect it the more with them: and an *Organ* is the use of those Gifts, as I may say, which are of *man's making*, or which man hath given to the Church, for the same end, to wit, the enlivening our dull affections, while we are meditating, praying, and praising the Almighty.

To return, we know that Christ bids his Disciples, when they were brought before Magistrates, they should leave it to the Spirit to direct them what they should speak, without solicitude for matter or words. It is a modest rule when any thing extraordinary is promised to the Church, that it is to be expected at first; but afterward we are to look only for what is ordinary. I believe that such assistance as that but in an ordinary way and manner is always to be expected by

by the godly with faith in all they are put upon for his glory : and upon supposition of the Spirits suggesting sometimes the very objects into the Ministers mind ( in such a way as is agreeable to spiritual operation though we are ignorant how ) which he knowes does besit the present frame of the Congregation, How much more likely is the performance of the duty after these motions, when there is a gift in the Minister to follow them, to affect the hearts of all present, then the performance of it after a *form* of man, whether of anothers, or his own composure.

This I must say with faithfulness ( who am not for the rust of any Ministers parts, seeing he hath such continual occasion to use them ), yet not without these two or three cautions. The one is that in the prayers which the Church hath composed we may humbly conceive that the Spirit of God did pitch the hearts of those who were to joyn in their gifts ( or judgements ) for the composure, upon those objects or matter which is most agreeable to our publick Congregations, as it does the heart of any single Minister upon those things as is most *agreeable to his will* for the present occasion. Another is, that if a Minister hath not the gift to express himself without study, and does therefore take pains for his prayer as for his Preaching, having a gift perhaps upon his pains and study (though none else) that does equal, if not excel his that hath the best without it, he may expect the same assistance on his study, that the Spirit should help his infirmities as to the putting in his mind those things which are most conducive for his people to receive, and most agreeable to  
his

his will to give, as any other may, who hath the readiest gift to follow his present motions. The last is, that though a Minister therefore should take heed of drying up his gifts by one constant form in the Pulpit where he hath liberty ; yet if any do so I do hold that it is not a sufficient ground for his people to run from him into separation ; for though that will make his Ministry the less comfortable, as the Ministry of one who hath less gifts must be less comfortable than one that hath greater, yet the *maius* and *minus* does not vary the species, and this reaches not to make the service unlawful. Besides, he who prayes with the largest gifts of prayer does but offer a stinted form ( which is said commonly ) as to the hearers particular state, and the stinting of the *Object* does not yet stint the Spirit however in his operation on the *affections*. *Praying alwaies with all manner of prayer and supplications in the Spirit.*

Praying *with the Spirit*, or by it, in the last place is that we find in the dayes of the Apostles when they had extraordinary administrations of the Spirit in gifts that were miraculous, insomuch that they spake with tongues and so preached and prayed. Those that spake ( I apprehend ) understood not themselves what they delivered, but every one in whose tongue they spake were edified, and therefore we read of some that did interpret. Those were such it is like as had skill in more tongues than their own, or else in case there were none such, the same miraculous power might enable some for the interpretation as others to speak. Thus praying *with the Spirit* is opposed to praying *with the under-*

*standing* : and the Apostle prefers praying with the understanding before it. There is no person had cause therefore to brag of this, if he had it; and there is none of any sect among us that pretend to it. And so I think (having said what I intended otherwise), that neither the Gentleman, nor I, need to be put to any more words about it. *I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also.*

---

#### C H A P. IV.

*Of the closer judgement of the Author (in his sixth Chapter) which is Arminian; and of Election, Free-will, and Grace, upon account of his opinion; Of the salvability of Heathen, and other incidental matters.*

**I** Descend to his sixth Chapter, which is to shew us, *who those are* to whom the Spirit is *promised* and *given*. These persons are *Believers*, who yet are not *holy persons*. This is his Notion. They cannot be holy till they have the Spirit to sanctifie them, and yet they must believe and pray because that is the condition upon which the Spirit is given. The holy Spirit consequently and his special grace is necessary to *Good works* or sanctification: but *Believing* is antecedent to it, or must be in a mans power, before it.

I must confess I am made sensible of the sagacity of this Author upon my reading this Chapter, which  
I did

I did not heed so much before, and I perceive which way his mind is hankering. It was this very light which carried St. *Augustine* so much in his first writings. The doctrine of *Pelagius* at the first broaching, consisted mainly in this point, that God did give his grace according to mens merits. This doctrine seemed to the Father too arrogant for man, and derogatory to God. That the grace of God and eternal life is given to some, and not to others, is manifest. That the reason must be in regard of something that one man does and not another, seemed to him undeniable. That good works should be it, appears against the Scripture, *not by works lest any man should boast*. Besides, if a man should be allowed to be able to do any good works to merit Gods grace by the strength of nature, what need were there of prayer for aid from God or the help of his Spirit? Man should have need of *industry* here, not *prayer*. If not *works* then, what must it be but that which is so often contradistinguished to works, and that is *Faith*? For the Scripture that saies *not of Works but of Grace*, does say likewise, *It is of faith that it may be of Grace*. Here then is that which must be in mans power. That a man could not do *good works* without grace St. *Austine* always asserted, for this was his meaning when he saies that *good works do not preceed but follow justification*, understanding by justifying, the making a man just by inherent grace, as the Schools do after him. But that a man can *believe* if he will by the use of his natural faculties only, is what he did maintain readily, thinking no body could deny it. According to this clear ap-

prehension as he then took it up, he did proceed to his doctrine of Election, which being defined by the Ancients before his time always *ex præscentia*, he now determines to be of this Faith foreseen. It must not be *ex operibus prævisis*, because that will oppose grace, but *ex prævisis fide*, and that will salve all objections. We are to conceive of other things to follow agreeably, as *Arminius* that acute and I think pious Divine hath since taken up the notion ( when *Augustine* himself retracted it ) and upon his own stock improved it.

It is me now ( I must say ) something notable to see the seeds of the same light springing up in this Gentleman as formerly actuated two such searching Divines as *Austin* and *Arminius* were : and I cannot therefore without guilt of dissingenuity pass over any thing which he hath offered for the farther cultivation of it. For doing this, I observe he enters first upon an adventure to make some change of our terms in Divinity. The *state of nature*, and a *state of Grace* are terms that signify *Regeneration* and *Unregeneration* with all men, even in our practical Books : and he will have us by a *state of Nature* to understand the *state of a Heathen*; and by a *state of Grace*, the state of every one under the Gospel. The Gospel now bringing a man into this state, a *state of Grace*, he distinguishes of this Grace the Gospel brings. And it is either that which goes before our Faith, or follows it. That which goes before he accounts it all *Common Grace*; that which is given after it, *special Grace*. Ordinarily, by the way, that grace which is given to the *Reprobate*, as well as to the *Elect*, we call *Com-*



*mon Grace*, and that which is *peculiar* to the *Elect* we call *special grace*, whether *before* or *after* Faith. But he offers his reason, The Grace which the Gospel brings, is either (says he) that which is given *upon condition*, or that which is given *upon none*. That which is conditional must be given only to some, because it is some only perform that condition, and that which is given but to some is *special Grace*. That which is given upon no condition, must be therefore (or rather may be) appropriated to all, and so is *Common Grace*. Thus he Theologizes, when we ordinarily do not account it *common* grace, because *every* one has it; but because the *Reprobate* as well as the *Elect* have it: and we do not call it *special Grace* only, because *some* have it, but because the *Elect* only have it: so that, that Grace which is given but to some, if it be given to any *Reprobate* as well as the *Elect*, we call not *special*, but *common* Grace. Well, but these terms being premised, that Grace now which he calls *special*, the grace of the Gospel, is promised on the *condition of Faith*. It is *Faith* is the first thing upon which all depends. If this be not in the power of every one, the terms of the Gospel shall be unperformable. And that this Faith may be in our power, he will have a preventing Grace (which is not the Grace it self of the Gospel, that being all *conditional*, but some Divine assistance accompanying it) as enables every body that hears the Gospel to believe, unless they wilfully reject it, He is afraid of Pelagianism, to allow that any do or can believe of their own strength without Grace (though *Austin* when he entertained this

mans thoughts, made no scruple of that) and therefore he will help out the good Father here very kindly with the intimation of a Grace, that being not confined to any condition, must be common, and so belong to all who are brought into that state, which is a *state of Grace*, the *state of being under the Gospel*. When Christ says, *Go preach the Gospel, he that believes not shall be damned*. It is repugnant (he argues) to the goodness and justice of God, that he should withhold that assistance as is necessary to make this condition *possible*, and *believing* without such Grace is *impossible*. Upon this Grace then, which all have, who have the word preached, a man becomes *his* Believer. This Faith or bare Christianity with Prayer is the condition of that promise, that *God will give his Holy Spirit to those that ask him*. The Spirit being given, we are to improve his Grace. This improvement is the condition of that farther promise, that *God will dwell in us*. That God will *give us his Spirit*, and that he will *dwell in us*, are the principal promises of Grace in the Gospel, I consent with this Author, understanding Grace only of these operations. This implies a plentiful communication of farther degrees of Grace for perseverance. Upon the condition of perseverance we shall be saved.

Lo here the notion of this worthy Author, wherein I think I have done him and my Reader right to present it with all the light about it, as I was able to draw it from him. I will now requite the ingenuity and liberty of his opinion, with the like freedom in my Animadversions.

In the first place I do apprehend that these things have lien in the mind of this Gentleman, not yet seven years ; and I think that a man had need to take no less time than *Jacob* served for *Rachel* , to consider well before he wed himself to a *Party* in the controversie of the *Five points*, especially if he take to that side which stands condemned by the Synod of *Dort*, with our British Divines in it ; who being sent thither by Authority , were to determine nothing we may be sure, but what was agreeable to the Doctrine of our Church ; and also when the Father who first sprang that notion which this Author is in quest of, did upon most mature deliberation himself forsake it, and that only (as I believe) upon a full conviction from the Scripture , which led him into the Doctrine of Absolute Election, which this man as suddenly rejects, as he maturely embraced , shewing himself even fond of it in all his latter Writings, even to the death. Which makes me add this moreover, that forasmuch as I see several of our younger Divines, being of more quick parts, so forward upon these points, I will pass my conjecture , that by that time they have well bred their teeth , they will not perhaps be so much in pain (as they seem now to be) to run into disputation (as they do) either with *Calvin*, or Doctor *Owen*.

In the second place I cannot lightly give the Gentleman my approbation to his new coin. I am sensible of so much hurt and ill consequence that may come of this boldness to go about to alter terms that have gotten into our Divinity , when it is not that of the *Schools* only, but of our *Sermons* and practical Books, that

that this Author is not aware of what he does. It is the raw Divine will take up these terms, and when he comes to use them, he will be so confounded himself, and confound the people that hear him, that they will be as those that speak in a strange tongue, one to another. For instance, what if a green Preacher comes and tells his Congregation after this Author, that all that hear him are in a state of Grace? What if he comes, and preaches on, that the Gospel gives no ground for us to expect any special Grace till we perform the condition of the Gospel? How odd must this appear to the hearers in any judicious Congregation, when we know the first Grace (we mean effectual) is given *without condition*? Yet let this Author explain these words for him; that by *special Grace* we must always understand Grace promised to *qualified persons*; so that all he means must be, that that Grace which is promised on condition, is not given till we perform the condition, the matter admits of no contradiction. Besides this evil, the new forming of terms which are received to other significations in the Church, is methinks but like a man who hath some very curious work to engrave, and when he has all those tools in his shop that are made on purpose for the doing that work, he will use his knife only. This may indeed commend the *rarity* and *industry*, but not the *wisdom* of that workman, who could have done his business better, if he had used those Instruments which were ready by him, and proper for it.

In the third place there is one thing I must needs observe, wherein I think this Gentleman in his Heterodoxy

rodoxy to be a little too Orthodox; and that is in his ordering the scheme of his notion so, as that the *homo Evangelizatus* only shall be the subject of God's Grace: that is, when he does hold forth a common Grace vouchsafed to all who are under the Gospel, enabling them to believe, if they will, upon which the promise of the Spirit belongs to them, and so the special Grace of it upon Gospel conditions unto everlasting life; he does leave all the world besides in such a state, as is without all Grace, and consequently in a remediless condition. Whereas he may find in the Schools, that there is an universal Grace maintained by many, which they call *sufficient* (and which indeed is that which this Author means by his *common* Grace), as no man is without, whether Heathen or Christian; in the improvement whereof, farther degrees are attainable upon the *Habenti dabitur*, till it comes to be effectual; so that it shall lie upon the liberty of the will in every body, whether they be saved or damned. I know the Author may desert these, and not be singular in this point of his opinion, so long as he hath the Fathers generally, St. *Cyprian* and St. *Augustine* more particularly, the Papist and Protestant Churches, with the eighteenth Article of our own on his side: and that which may please this Author something more, I remember *Arminius* in some place of his works, does expressly exclude all Heathens from salvation; though many that have tread in his steps otherwise, have been more kind to the Nations. I have some little light therefore here (or I believe it to be so) to offer to this very susceptible person. There is a three-fold Government (in one, to

H

speak



speak accurately ) that God hath had in the world  
 over man in reference to his chief end, the salvation  
 of his soul. The first was by the Law of Nature, the  
 second, by the Law of *Moses*, and the third by the  
 Law of Christ. Before God gave his Law unto *Is-  
 rael*, the whole world was under that Law, which is  
*written in the heart*. God must govern man by that  
 only, when there was no other. This Law now, *writ-  
 in mans heart* (we are to know) is two-fold ; for Na-  
 ture coming under a double consideration , as *entire*,  
 and as *fallen*, the Law must be double ; the Law of  
*innocent nature* (or *Law of Innocency*), and the Law  
 of *lapsed nature*, which is the *Law of Grace* or mer-  
 cy toward man in regard to that condition. To ex-  
 press it more fully, there is *Lex Naturæ* *ad* *idoneum* ,  
 and *Lex connaturalis gratiæ* ; The *Law of Nature*,  
 and the *connatural Law of Grace* , as *Suarez* has  
 it in his Book *De Legibus*. I am pleased much with  
 the terms, though I found not that he did well un-  
 derstand them, or explain them himself. Only thus  
 much he says, that the Ancients before *Moses* , who  
 were governed by the Law of Nature only, must have  
 this *Lex connaturalis gratiæ* together with it , or  
 comprehended under it ; or else no man then upon  
 earth could be saved : which is a truth so evident,  
 as makes the proof of that Law , by that reason  
 alone, to be good. When he terms this Law then a  
*Law connatural*, I understand by it, that this Law of  
 lapsed Nature, this Law of Grace, or remedying Law  
 is written in the heart of man , in regard to his *fal-  
 len* nature, no less than the Law of *pure nature*  
 it self was. The Law of Nature, as I take it, is the  
 dictates



dictates of right reason, declaring to us our duty to God, to our selves, and to our neighbours ; and the light of the same reason will dictate to us, when we have failed in that duty, to repent and turn to God with trusting to his mercy and pardon if we do so, and not else. We do find it legible in our hearts that God is good and wisely gracious to pity our infirmities, and consider our lost estate, and necessary frailty, as that there is a God, and any worship that is at all due to him. *There is mercy with thee that thou shouldst be feared.* And these Characters thus engraven in the heart of man, is the same law of Grace in the practical contents, as is more largely paraphrased upon, by the *Prophets* in the *Old*, and the *Aposiles* in the *New-Testament*. There is no difference at all in the *Substance* ( as Divines speak ) but in the *Adminisration*. It is as one lately hath expressed it lively ) no otherwise than as a Book thrice Printed ; the second Edition is larger than the first, and the third most compleat and perfect. This I will say, the Covenant was still on foot ; the Condition sincerity according to their light ; men were judged by it, and many saved. Here only is the difference, that the foundation on which all this is laid, the Mediation, Righteousness and Sacrifice of Christ, comes not to be revealed but in *Types*, and darker promises, till the promulgation of the Gospel. Now, I say, that though the Heathen be not under ( or have not ) this Law of Grace, in the third and last setting out, or in the state under the Gospel ; yet they are under it ( or have it ) in the state of the Ancients, or as they had it in the first promulgation ;

and upon supposition that any of them do according to the light they have, live up in sincerity to this Law; I dare not be the man that shall deny but *through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ* (procuring this Law or Covenant for them, as for us, and all the world) *they shall be saved even as we*, and we shall be saved *even as they*. Not to leave this yet. I have learned from *Cicero*, that all Laws must be derived from the Divine Reason and Will. I have learned from others, that this Reason of God in his Government of all things agreeably to his own nature and the nature of his Creatures is the *Eternal Law*. I have learned from the Scripture, that there is a *Law of Works*, and a *Law of Grace*. I do learn by consequence that these Laws (as frames of Gods Government over man) must be reconcileable with the *Eternal Law*, or the reason of his *Wisdom*, and *Justice*, and *Goodness*; the one of them being fit for the estate of man in *Innocency*, the other for his *Lapsed* condition. How these Laws do now consist, and not consist with one another, while the Scripture saies sometimes we are *freed from the Law*, and sometimes that it is *established*, That not a *title of it shall pass*, and that we are *not under the Law, but under Grace*, I do not intend here any full decision. I will draw only one chief stroke towards it. The Law may be considered as the *Rule of man's duty*, or Measure of Good and Evil according to his own nature, and Gods: Or as the *Instrument of God's Government* over man, or Measure of his dealing with us, or judging of us, according to our discernings. It cannot be conceived but so long as the *Nature of God and Man*:

Man is the same, and *Good* and *Evil* ( which consists in an agreeableness to them both ) is the same, the *Law of Nature* must remain unchangeable as the measure of our moral actions : But as it is the instrument of Gods Government in the world, it is as certain that through the Mediation of Christ ( who hath satisfied his Father for our breach of it ) it is *relaxed* so as we are not dealt withal according to the tenour of the *Law*, in the matters of *this* life, or of that which is to *come*. I distinguish these two things, a *Rule of Life*, and a *Rule for Life*. A *Rule for Life* is expressed in these words, *He that doeth them shall live in them*. We are freed from the Law upon the *later* account : we are made free to it in regard to the *former*. That is, we are under the Law so as we are still bound to *live* according to it : but we are delivered from it so as ( through mercy, and the merits of Christ ) we shall not be *judged* by it. There is *Norma vite* : and *Norma judicii*. The Law is of force as a *rule of Life*, or *Duty* : but we are not under it as a *rule of Judgement*. We shall be judged saies *St. James* by the *Law of Liberty* ; and *Paul* saies, according to my Gospel. Blessed be God for this truth. Now that the Government of God over the whole world is by the Law of *Grace*, and not of *Works* ( thus much being said imperfectly only for light in the way ), does appear as the *Sun* or *Moon* in the Heavens. For God hath not left himself without witness, in that he does good, and gives us fruitful seasons. These are effects of his mercy, which he could not shew to the world as he does, if he dealt with it according to the Law of

*Works.* When *Abraham* pleads with God for *Sodom* that he would spare it if there were ten righteous persons in it, it is manifest that he must account of Gods Government over the earth to be a Government of Grace. *That the righteous be as the wicked, that be far from thee* (saies he) *shall not the judge of all the earth do right?* If God should do but right to the best of men according to the righteousness of the Law of Works, there could be no such pleading as this. Neither is there any righteous, *no not one*, saies the Scripture, nor could God have accepted of *Abraham* himself for one, had there been nine besides, but upon the account of the Law of Grace. It is a righteousness consisting in a condecency of his Goodness and Mercy, and not in the Rule of his strict Holiness that *Abraham* intends. When the Prophets call upon *Israel* to repent and to *do righteousness* that they may *live*, it is a perpetual discovery that God dealt not with them according to the Covenant of Works. The Law admits no repentance, and there is no righteousness that a man can *live by* according to the Law. It is such a righteousness then they must mean still, which is the same with the *just mans faith*, whereby it is said he *shall live*; and that is the *righteousness of faith* in the Gospel, or *righteousness of God*, which lies in a conformity to the law of Grace (See *Mediocria*, about the beginning of my Paper of the *Covenants*). We are righteous according to this Law, when we perform the condition: God is righteous according to it, when he accepts us thereupon, unto Pardon and Life. We have a most signal instance in the *Ninevites*, of these

two things I do here stand upon. If Gods government over the Heathen was not by the *Law of Grace*, how could the *Ninevites* by their repentance have diverted his judgements? And if this Law had not been *connatural* with *faln* man, so as to be *written in their hearts*, how could they trust in God, that upon their forsaking sin, and their turning to him, they should find mercy, and be saved from destruction? Both these things ( I say ) have in this one instance their full evidence. And what think we of *Cornelius* the Centurion and *Roman*, how could his *Prayers* and *Almes* be *accepted with God*, if *Cornelius* as well as *Paul*, a *Roman* as well as *Jew*, were not under the same Government of Grace, when there is nothing we do but is imperfect, and lyable to a curse by the Law of Works? And what shall we conclude then from both instances, but that which *Peter* upon conviction himself concludes? *Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness is accepted of him.* There are three things go to a Law. That it be for the publick good, That it be the will of the Lawgiver, That it be promulgated to the subject. That the Law of Grace is good for the world there can be no question; That it is Gods will the world should be governed by it, appears by what is spoken, and that this Law hath been promulgated to mankind, appears both in the general notice of it in mens hearts ( *I will write my Law in their hearts* saies God in the New Covenant, as distinguished from that of the Jews ), and in the exprefs declaration of God to our  
first



first Parents, that the *seed of the Woman should break the Serpents head*, and in his Covenanting with *Noah*, which must be understood without dispute in regard to them, and their posterity. Now when such a Law hath been promulgated to *Adam* and *Noah* as belonging to all the world, being to come of them, it must be proved that this Law is, or hath been somewhere, or at some time, again repealed by God, or else must every man and woman in the world be under this government of God according to it, and consequently be in a capacity of Salvation. I will to these Reasonings, add one syllogism. *It is not the hearers of the Law, but doers shall be justified.* This is express in one Verse of the second to the *Romans*. But some Heathen are doers of the Law, though not hearers of it. This is affirmed in the next Verse. *For when the Gentiles, which have not the Law, do by nature the things contained in the Law*, with the rest following. *Ergo*, some Heathen are justified and saved. If any cavil and say that no man is a doer of the Law, he must be answered that the Apostle here speaks of such a doing only as is supposed to be among the Jews that were godly, or Jews *inwardly* in the Verses after. And I renew my argument. They that are doers of the Law according to the sense of such Texts as make the keeping the Commandments of God necessary to Salvation, such as when Christ saies, *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments*; and such as when the Apostle saies, *They that by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory*, shall have *eternal life*, that is, They who are doers of it, as all that are Jews inward-



*inwardly and in the Spirit* do keep it, and no other-  
 wise, to wit, not *κατὰ ἀνθρώπων* but *κατὰ συνειδήσεως*, not ac-  
 cording to the rigour of the Law, but according to  
 acceptance by the equity of the Gospel. They, I say,  
 shall be justified and saved. But some Heathen are  
 doers of the Law in this sense, which is the sense of  
 the Apostle. Ergo, some Heathen are justified and  
 saved. I confirm the Minor by the words ensuing,  
 that we may be sure we have the mind of the Apo-  
 stle. Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righ-  
 teousness of the Law, shall not his uncircumcision be  
 counted for circumcision? And shall not uncircum-  
 cision which is by nature if it fulfil the Law, judge  
 thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost break  
 the Law? It follows that such as these therefore  
 are Jews inwardly, and in the Spirit, though they  
 were not outward Jews, or in the flesh, or of the Cir-  
 cumcision, as is apparent in the words already, and  
 the last Verses. They that are Jews inwardly and  
 in the Spirit then (I follow my argument), though  
 not outwardly so and in the flesh, do fulfill the Law  
 in the sense of this place and are justified. But such  
 are some of the Heathen here according to the Apo-  
 stle. Ergo, some Heathen are justified and saved.  
 And what could be desired more full and convincing,  
 if it were not for the first Verse which follows in  
 the next Chapter, which does yet add such abound-  
 ing confirmation to it, as I must profess my self  
 perfectly stricken with the evidence, as with a  
 Beam of light never to be withstood, or any more  
 to be doubted. What advantage then hath the  
 Jew above the Gentile? These are the words.

It cannot be imagined by me now, that this question could be offered after he had said thus much, if there were such a difference between these two, as that one of them only was under a possibility of Salvation. It is brought in as an objection to his foregoing assertion in this sense, that if this be true, there appears no difference in the matter, whether a man be Jew or Gentile, seeing he that hath the Law only written in his heart, and keeps it (that is in sincerity), shall have the benefit and be saved, as well as he that hath it written in the Bible. The Apostle does as good as answer, This is true; yet is there a difference, *Chiefly because that unto the Jew were committed the Oracles of God.* I interpret not these words, but give this paraphrase. The Heathen were under the same law of Grace for life, as the Jews; but the Jews advantage was, that they had it in the second promulgation with this privilege of Ordinances: and our advantage is the like over them, that we have it in the third and last promulgation, by the Gospel. I argue then once more. If this was the chief advantage the Jew had over the Gentile; that one had the Oracles of God and the other had not, then was there not this difference between them, as my Gentleman does make, that one is only in a *state of Nature*, and the other in a *state of Grace*; or that one was in a *capacity*, and the other under an *impossibility* of Salvation; for this were an advantage of a far greater nature. But this was the *chief* advantage. *Chiefly because--- Ergo.* The Objections against this Doctrine are two. The one is from the Scriptures, which in many places in the New-Testament do require

quire faith in Christ, or believing the Gospel, as the condition of Salvation. *He that believeth not shall be damned.* I answer, As the Apostle saies of the Law, *Now we know that whatsoever things the Law saith, it saith to them that are under the Law:* So say I of the Gospel, whatsoever things of this kind the Gospel saith, it saith to those that are under the Gospel. Where the Gospel is Preached, and the Revelation is sufficient, so that men wilfully reject it, such are left without excuse. The case of such is dangerous indeed, and these Texts applicable to them. *If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.* But as for those who never heard the Gospel, or when the Revelation hath been insufficient for such conviction, the case (I hope) is otherwise. The case is (I think) as I have said; and our good God will not require of any, more than he hath given. The other objection is from the authority of men, or of the Church more generally, that condemns this opinion: But I count the testimony of Christians in this point is for themselves, and so partial; I suppose it taken again upon trust, and followed by the most for want of light; I believe also that if they had had but this light only that I offer, they would have determined as I do. It is true, I grant, as our Church thinks, that there is no Religion *by which* a man can be saved, but one only, that is the true Religion; but this is a great truth here to be received, that Christianity in the root, according to what is said, is indeed the universal Religion of mankind (*whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you*): So that the *οἱ ἀληθῶς θιούτες*, those that live according to

Reason, such as *Socrates*, *Heraclitus*, and the like men, were *Christians*, though they were not so called, according to *Justin* the holy Martyr in his Apology, whatsoever Ancients besides we have for us. Which doctrine nevertheless (to salve most fully the eighteenth Article of our Church at first mentioned) is not once to be thought on, or harboured, but as it is compatible with this certain Position, that there is no way (for all that) under Heaven whereby a man or woman is, or was, or can be saved, but in and through the only *Name* and Mediation of our Saviour. *For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus.*

In the fourth place, I must require a better explanation from this Author, how every man and woman that hath the Gospel preached to them, are brought into such a state of grace, as to have that assistance from the Spirit of God which enables them to believe, and many of them effectually unto Salvation: and yet that it is the Believer only is the Object of that promise that God will *give his Spirit to them that ask him*. There are two of his Chapters where he enumerates the effects of the Spirit, and he does in both make faith to be one and the chief of those effects (that he may not find here any evasion): yet does he make faith the condition of that promise. How will he come off here? Untill a man be a Believer, or have faith, the promise of Gods giving his Spirit belongs not to him, and yet is faith (and teachableness in order to it) an effect of the Spirit. That which is promised on a condition, is not obtained but by our performance of the condition,

on, himself argues somewhere. If Faith then be the *thing promised*, how can it be the *condition* of the Promise? If the Spirit that works Faith, or the Spirit in regard to this effect is promised to the Believer, then is Faith made a condition for obtaining *it self*, when it is made so, for obtaining the *Spirit* that gives it. If we must believe that we may have the Spirit, how comes Faith to be the effect of having it? To be the condition which is antecedent to it, and to be the effect also which follows it, is methinks impossible. He may shist perhaps, and distinguish. There is a Faith that makes a man a Christian or his *Believer*: and a faith that makes a man *holy* and is saving. The one may be the condition of the other. Well, I will ask him then of the former, Is that faith I pray, the effect of a mans own strength or freewill: or of the Spirit? If he say the first, what thinks he of that saying of our Lord, *Without me ye can do nothing*, that is, nothing to any saving purpose (to use the apt words of this Author elsewhere) when it is *something* I think to *purpose* to do that as shall qualifie a man to be the Object of this promise, that God will give him his Spirit upon his asking, and the promise otherwife did not belong to him: Especially seeing this Gentleman thinks it *Pelagianism* to allow so much without grace, and therefore does he set up his common grace to avoid that danger. If it be not of our selves, but of the Spirit, then have we here one of his Operations, (though the Spirit is promised in *Luke* in regard to all its effects and operations, if that which the Author saies in two Chapters about it, be valid) and so the difficulty re-



turns. How shall a man have the Spirit for this operation or effect before faith, and yet faith be the condition of the Spirit and its operations? If he say that the *grace* which he calls *common*, or the *Spirit* as *not promised*, does work in a man truly one sort of faith, or so much of a saving faith, as goes to the condition of the promise: and that another sort of faith then, or so much more as is lacking to our faith, does flow ( as the effect only thereof ) from the promise after, when we perform this condition, he will be put very hard to it in such a work as was that of *Pauls* conversion, and be forced to more curiosity than enough, in so critical a determination.

In the fifth place, I have one argument to advance against this Doctrine of his, which is known *Arminian*. I will urge but one, because it is the common cause, and he may find out as many more as he will in others. It is this. If there be that grace which he calls *common* vouchsafed to all under the Gospel without any difference of election, so that there is the same and no other prepared for him that believes, and for him that believes not, which common grace then is left to the liberty of the will of every individual person to co-operate with it or not; and as a man does so, or does not, he brings himself into a state of Salvation, or remains in a state of wrath ( this is the opinion ), then must Man himself, or then must the Will of every man for himself, make the difference between him and another. But this, according to the judgement of most after *Austin*, is flat against the Scripture. *Who hath made thee to differ from another, and what is there, O man, that thou*



*thou hast not received?* I must add by way of strength to the Argument, that upon this Hypothesis it follows, that, that which is the *less* only, or least conducing to mans Salvation is attributed to *God*, and that which is the *greater* and most conducive thereunto is ascribed to *man himself*. It is more to *believe* and *repent*, than it is to have *power* to believe and repent. The promise of Life and Salvation is not made to him that is *enabled* to believe, but to him that *does* believe, and obey the Gospel. Now by the *Arminian doctrine* there is this grace carefully provided, which shall enable every man to believe and repent, so that the fault shall not lye on God if they do not, but on a mans own will: but the *will* or *willing* it self must arise from that liberty which they are as careful to reserve unto man. That which is the *lesser* thing then (I say) the *ability* (through divine Help, Assistance or Grace which is sufficient for the impowring every one) to *believe* and be saved, is ascribed to *God*, and acknowledged from him: but that which is the *greater*, which is the chief, that which does the work, the act it self of willing, of believing, and performing the terms of the Gospel, is made the effect of *mans* own *free-will*. And yet farther to confirm the same argument. The *power* to do is one thing, and the *will* and *doing* another; The *grace* one thing, and the *co-operating* with it another. If we have *power* now or assistance only from *God*, and the *will* be of our *selves*, then is there *something*, even this willing it self, this believing it self, this will to believe (or co-operating with this common grace) that is the greatest

greatest thing, *which we have not received*, but is of our selves, or from our own strength. I do not doubt but I may press this yet more closely if this Author should give the occasion; and I must advise him heartily to be very considerate, what he answers to this argument; because I have pickt it out as that which I take to be the most momentous of any which are ordinarily urged by the Orthodox in this matter. I will close it up with that Text, *Work out your salvation with fear and trembling*, saies the Apostle. This implies that a man hath power, or that if he will work he *can*. It is in vain to exhort any to do that which is not in their power. That which is less than [*the power to do if we will*] is I count in man: but that which is the greater [*the willing and doing*] is aliunde, of God, as it appears in the words following. *For it is God that worketh in us to will and to do of his good pleasure*. So contrary are my apprehensions here to this Gentlemans. A man must have power (he thinks) by all means from God (to this end he brings in his common grace), but the *will* must be of himself. I think now quite otherwise that *power* is of nature, for that is the less: and to reduce that power unto act, *to will and to do*, that is of grace, for that is the greater, or that which is most. *It is not of him that willeth and runneth* (to wit, that he wills and and runs, saies the Father) *but of God that sheweth mercy*.

In the sixth place then, I have a mind to tell him some little of what I think of this grace he calls *common*. The term *Grace* (we must know) which is all one with *Favour*, does import a respect shewn to  
*some*

some which is not to *others*, and does herein differ from *Justice*, which *respects no person* above another, but does distribute that which is due to every one without partiality. It is otherwise in *Grace*, for there are two things quite contrary must go to the making any thing a matter of *Favour*; it must be a thing not due, or of right, for then there is place to exercise *Justice*, but not *Grace*, and it must be given out of *Choice*, it must be vouchsafed to *one* and not *another*, when it is due to *neither*. When this Author then, and the Schools do speak of a *Grace* that is Common and Universal, they seem to be teachers of something wherein they understand not *what they speak*, or *whereof they affirm*. There is the grace of the Gospel, or that *Grace* which the Gospel publishes, *which brings Salvation to all men*, the *Objective* grace of it, consisting in *that faithful saying worthy of all acceptation, that Christ died for sinners*, or that those that believe and repent shall be saved, or that God is Good, and those who turn to him, though they have sinned, shall find mercy, which is the substance of the whole two Testaments, and that indeed is Universal, and belongs alike to all the world. There is no man or woman, or no people but they are under the Law of *Grace* (purchased by Christ) for life and salvation, I have said; and say, that the Gospel of this *Grace*, or the discovery of it, is so far universal also, as there are none but by tradition from their Parents, or by some Teachers, as *Noah* was to the old world, teaching this Law (for there never was any other righteousness since *Adam* fell, but of this Law only to save any), or by the dictates of

their own hearts, did, or do understand it in some measure, so that if they live up to this Law according to the light only which they have, they are not only under the *possibility*, but in a *state* of Salvation. This is a noble truth and worthy of God and his goodness, and I cannot part with it. But for that Grace which is the *subjective* grace of God, consisting in those operations of his Spirit that bring over the hearts of men to perform those terms which this Law of grace requires of us, To speak of that as common and belonging to all, is ( I say ) to speak of what this Author *knowes not*, because these Operations are for certain secret and indiscernible ; and to *affirm* of that which he knows not, what is inconsistent with the nature of what he speaks. For if those operations belong to all, and are not vouchsafed to some peculiar persons only with discrimination from others, they are not *Grace*. This is so true, that when I say, the grace of the Gospel which is *Objective* is universal to all mankind, if there were not other creatures besides men, to whom Redemption and Reconciliation is not vouchsafed as to us, it could not be called *Grace*. It were a *Benefit*, and infinitely great, but not properly *Grace*. There is a world of fallen Spirits, as well as men, and there was nothing due to the one or the other but punishment : yet when no kindness was due, the Son of God came from Heaven, and took on him our nature to redeem us and not them, this makes the Redemption of Christ to be grace to us. And now when the benefit, or benefits purchased by Christ are applied to particular persons by the operations of the Spirit

Spirit working Faith and Repentance ( which are the conditions upon which they are applied ) in some persons and not in others, if these operations were indeed common and vouchsafed to those that believe and repent *not*, as well as those that *do*, this Application were not of Grace. Where there is none *refused*, there is no *election*. If one be not *preferred*, and not another, or before another, there is no *Grace*. The ground of this opinion of sufficient grace common to all, hath arose as I conjecture, from an apprehension that the help or assistance of God ( which we call grace ) is conversant about the *Power* which is in man, so that a man is *enabled* thereby only to act, but the *Will* or actual willing is of *himself*. St. *Austine*, I remember, does tell us, that this was the conceit of *Pelagius*, and he sets himself therefore to prove, that Grace is conversant about the *will*; it is Grace ( saies he ) that *inclines the will*, it is of God to work in us *to Will and to Do* of his own good pleasure. And indeed I do not see how it can consist with the nature of the Spirit of God, who is God, that is, with the simplicity of the Divine Nature, which is devoid of all composition, Subject and Accident, Power and Act, how any *operation* can be attributed to him, but in regard of some *effect*. If there be such an operation then imagined, which is sufficient only to produce such an effect on man, but it is hindered by the resistance of his will, here being no effect, there is no operation can be ascribed to God, in whom there is but one eternal standing Will, the Will being not taken for the *Faculty* neither, but *Act*. Besides this determination of the



Schools that God is a *Pure Act*, and can be capable of no new operations, but only as he is denominated an Agent from such continued new effects ( wherein my own understanding, I confess, must be ever at a loss ); there is this plain thing to be thought on by every body, that no wise person who is not destitute of power, does operate without *Effect*. 'Tis true, that the Scripture somewhere speaks of *resisting the Spirit*, and *receiving his grace in vain*: but this is not to be understood ( I suppose ) so, as if there were no effects wrought on such souls, but that there are *farther effects*, saving effects, and it is to be attributed to the obstinacy or wickedness of their Wills, that those effects are not wrought also. I must therefore deliver here my opinion of this universal sufficient Grace which I find in the Schools, and in the *Arminians*, but confined to those under the Gospel by this Author; and I do think really it is an invention only to put off St. *Augustine*, and to escape the condemnation of *Pelagius*, in a point, which in the substance of it, they judge fit to be maintained. The point is this, that if man does what lies in his power, God in his justice will give him his grace, *Facienti quod in se est Deus non potest, nec debet denegare gratiam*, which I mention the rather, because I see this Doctrine laid down in some good Books of late without suspicion of *Pelagianism* in it. Well! If any say now, that man by doing what he can of his own strength does obtain Gods grace, this shall be *Pelagianism*, and be anathematized by the Schools themselves: but if he say, that by doing *through Gods grace* what he can, he shall obtain (or

merit



merit) more grace, and so justification and life, it shall be the doctrine of the Church. Let it here be but supposed then, that God gives his *Grace* or assistance to *All* that they may act, and that which *Pelagius* would have, is brought in for good Doctrine without any heresie at all in it; and this is the device of the *Arminian* from the Schools, which if it were in *rerum natura*, as in mens *Books*, I do apprehend that *Pelagius* or *Austine* would have light upon it; and then would the one have received *Pelagius* opinion with more candor, and the other would have defended it so cleverly, as never to have been condemned. But if this *universal sufficient grace* was indeed never thought upon till after their time, I wonder not that *Pelagius* and *Austine* could not be agreed, but I do wonder that any who believe this knack should make so much matter of it whether they agreed or no. I think it really but much at one to hold that every one hath power by *Nature*, as to affirm that all have *Grace*. If *Grace* be as common as *Nature*, why is it called *Grace*? Not that I see any hurt in holding *Sufficient* grace, provided that *Effectual* be held also. If *universal* grace be brought in for exclusion of *special* grace, I can by no means admit of it, for that some persons have that grace from God whereby they are effectually wrought upon and saved, and not others, is beyond disputation. If *sufficient* grace common to all, and *special* too, be held so, as it be conceived that no man for all the one, does ever savingly believe and repent, or is truly converted, till he have the other also, there is no hurt in it, but I see no need of it. What need is

there of Grace only to bring us power, which we have already? There is no man shall be condemned for his *cannot*, but his *will not*. Every man then must have *power*. A man hath his faculties, his Understanding, his Will and his Executive power. The object is proposed, His duty known; There is nothing to hinder, He may act if he will. The Scripture indeed speaks of a *Cannot*, that we *can do nothing*, that we are *dead* in trespasses and the like: but all these expressions put together comes to this, to wit, *such an indisposition on the soul, as that a man certainly never will of himself*. This is the Scripture's *cannot* truly defined ( *Sec Mediocria*, in the Paper of Election ), which otherwhere therefore is ordinarily called a *will not*. You *will not come to me that you may have life*. There is *Natural* power still, where yet there is *Moral* impotency, as others have it. And it is no absurd thing ( I hope ) to say a man can do what he can; that is, he can do, what he hath *natural power* to do. Here then I will stick, *Power* is of *Nature* ( I said it before ), but to *exert that power* into act, is of *Grace*. *Power* is of *Nature*, but to *Will* and to *Do*, is of *God*. There is no people but have the Object ( I count ) and some light of it ( in their measure ) so that every body may live according to what he *hath*, and be accepted if he will. I grant this to the *Pelagian*, to the Schools, to the *Arminian*, that every one may, if they will: *The Spirit saies come, and the Bride saies come, and whosoever will let him come*. What can I say more? Whosoever will believe and repent, may believe and repent; whosoever will be saved, may

may be saved. This I say with them, but I must then say again with the Orthodox, that if any *will*, it is of the grace of God. If *he will*, it is of Gods *grace* against *Pelagius*. No man cometh to me unless the Father draw him. If *he will*, it is of Gods *special* grace against the *Arminian*. But ye believe not, because ye are not of *my* sheep. As many as were ordained to salvation believed. In short then, whosoever will, *may* ( or can ) : but no man *will* (though he can ) without *grace*, and *this* grace. Here is the decision of this great controversy. And as for the *Arminian* grace, what good of that, which if one had it not, he should have pleaded a Cannot, and been excused : but by having it he must be condemned ?

In the last place, seeing I perceive this Gentleman is list for *Arminianism*, I care not if I tell him yet some more of my heart about it. I am pretty sensible how things hang together. If God intend to give grace and salvation to a few particular persons, it is suitable that such only should be redeemed ; and if this grace be free as decreed absolutely to these, it is suitable the will be not free, so as to be able to choose or refuse it ; It is then agreeable that those be kept by the same almighty power to salvation. Here are the five points on one side. On the other hand, If a man that hath grace, is to take heed lest he fall, it is suitable that grace be such as might be refused at first, as well as it may ( after ) be lost ; That the will consequently is free, so as to co-operate with it or not ; That Christ therefore hath purchased but the same grace for one as well as another ; That  
Election

Election then be of such persons as use their own liberty, and Gods grace, as they ought, when those that do not, are justly rejected and condemned. I must declare now, I find here no aversion in my mind against the last set of opinions, but rather some disinclination to the former. I feel my genius more afraid of a captivity by that we call Orthodoxism, than by any thing else; which makes me come with less prejudice to read *Vorstius*, than *Rutherford*, or *Twisse*. I have no *preoccupation*, therefore I am sure on my *affections*, whatsoever I have on my *judgement* in these points. Nevertheless there is a chain laid on my soul from the holy Scriptures, which holds it fast. The chain consists of these links, *Personal Election*, *Regeneration*, and that, *Few shall be saved*. These three Doctrines I must say, are so concatenated (in my mind) one with another, that so long as any one of them will hold, it is in vain to make any attempt to get loose from either of the other. I cannot but confess many times they are grievous to my mind, and I could wish they were otherwise, but if they are the dictates of holy writ, I must pray to God to forgive my reluctancy, and submit to them. I have had indeed sometimes in my soul some other notion of Election than is expressed ordinarily by others. I have lookt methinks on the deliberations of the Almighty with his Son from eternity (to speak after the manner of men), to be how they should be glorified most in the Salvation of man: and there are two waies to that end, the *way of Works*, and the *way of Grace*. If man being made after Gods image, does live according to the law of his Creation, and stand

stand in that estate he must be happy and glorifie his Maker in a method of *works*: but if he be left to himself, and fall, and be recovered by the redemption of the Son, and then have a new Law for his fallen condition, and continued help, to live according to it, then shall God glorifie himself in mans salvation, by the methods of his most wonderful *grace*. Now what if Gods election from eternity be nothing else but this design, that mans salvation shall be in a way of *Grace*, and not of *Works*? He hath chosen *us in him* (saies the Text) *that we should be holy*. I put the Emphasis on the words, *in him*. It is Christ hath procured the new Law, according to which we may be holy and accepted, when else we could not be holy by the *Law* of our *Nature*; and so it is not *by the works of righteousness which we have done*, or works by *that Law*, but by the *renewing of the Holy Ghost*, or his assistance to perform the *Law of Grace*; so that when it is said otherwise, *Not of works lest any should boast*, it is added, *For we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus to good works*. We were created at first to a law of righteousness, but this being once broken, unless we had had a new Law purchased by Christ; and a new Creation through him, we could not have been righteous any more; so that it is not of works, which are properly mans own, according to the Law of his *Nature*, but of those which we are created to in Christ Jesus; to wit, those which are called the *righteousness of God* (as being of his invention or appointment) in opposition to the *Law*, that we are saved. This is typed in the *children of the Flesh*, and



the children of the Promise; and this may be the meaning of these words, *It is not of him that willeteth and runneth* (that is, it is not in the way of works) *but of God that sheweth mercy* (that is, but of Grace). This is delivered here, I know, roughly and darkly: yet may it serve another man to think upon, when I my self do not pursue it. There is in the Papers called the *Middle way*, something of this in that of *Election* p. 15, 16. and something more accurately in that of the *Covenants* p. 6, ad 13. There is another notion of Election; To wit, the choosing of persons or a people to a Church-state, or the privilege of Ordinances, and so unto the peculiar government of God or Christ over them upon that account. *He hath given his Statutes to Israel, he hath not done so to other Nations.* Thus *Abraham* is the first *Elect* we read of. *Thou didst choose Abraham, and broughtst him out of Ur, and madest a Covenant with him, in Nehemiah.* That was by way of preamble to Gods gathering a Church out of his seed, who was to be his people. Hence is he said in several places to have chosen them, not for their deserts, or their number, but *because he loved thy Fathers, therefore he chose their seed after them*; and hence have they the titles of a *peculiar people*, and a *chosen generation*, with many the like expressions. In the New-Testament likewise we find those who receive the Gospel have the same titles. They are said to be engrafted into the Jews *Olive*, that is, into their external Covenant and Church-state, and to be a *chosen generation* (as the Jews were) a *royal Priesthood*, and a *peculiar people*, inasmuch as when the Apostle



Apostle writes to a whole Church, he calls them *Elect*, as well as *Saints* and *sanctified in Christ Jesus*; And the *faith of Gods elect* may perhaps be thus interpreted the *Christian faith*. Blessed is the Nation whose God is the Lord, and the people whom he hath chosen for his own inheritance. These notions I mention, but must travail no further in the search of them, because I am held by the other doctrines I have named, *Regeneration*, and That few shall be saved. For if these two Doctrines be not capable of some other notion also than what is commonly understood by them, they must fix me in the like received notion of Election. If there is such a thing then ( in the first place ) as *Regeneration*, that is a work of grace on the souls of some persons whereby they are begotten again to a holy life, as well as to the relation of the children of God, then is Election, I must say, *actuated* in such persons. The Schools distinguish between *Eternal* and *Actual* Election, and this work of saving conversion or effectual vocation they call *Actual election*. Election is the preparation of effectual grace for some persons that they may be saved, and not for others. This effectual grace then vouchsafed to any particular person in, or for his regeneration, is the *execution* of Election. Such dependance have these doctrines upon one another, that we shall not need to enquire farther what is Election, which we understand; and prove by this effect Regeneration, better than by any mans definition, or arguments. If we cannot come off therefore about *Regeneration*, as well as *Election*, we must be determined by the one, in our judgement concerning

the other. For the helping us out here, this Author hath said something; That to be regenerate is to become the Disciple of Christ, and that is to be brought into the Church or Church-state, which agrees with the second Notion before of Election. He that is a Disciple must be baptized, and to be baptized is to be both again by water, and incorporated into Christ, and he that is but externally in Christ is a *new creature*, as one of that *world to come* in the second to the *Hebrews*, which is said to be *put in subjection to Christ*, that is the Christian Church under the Gospel. Agreeably hereunto this Author tells us out of Dr. Hammond, that the *proselytes* of the very Jewish Church were called *recensiti* upon this same account. Regeneration then may be a *Relative* term only, or but *Relative grace*, whether in regard to a *Spiritual*, or *External* relation. What this may do now with others, I know not. This Author does make Regeneration to consist in a *Real work* on the soul as well as others, while he defines the regenerate man to be one that does not only become a *Disciple*, but a *sincere Disciple* of Christ; for this includes that effectual grace which proceeds from Election. And yet if we could get off from both these Doctrines, *Election* and *Regeneration*, there remains farther the third Doctrine, *That few shall be saved*, from which there is no man I ever yet read, *Arminian* or *Antiarminian* that sought an escape. They are words out of our Lords own mouth [ *Few there be that find it* ], and the Evangelist that set them down could not be mistaken in Christs meaning; There is no mans heart can serve him

him to think so, because they were inspired in what they writ, If this be a truth then, that few shall be saved, it is a truth that it is Gods *will* that few shall be saved; and consequently if his *will*, his *decree*. If it be Gods *decree* then, that *few shall be saved*, I cannot be solicitous any farther about Personal or Absolute Election, There appears to me really to be a greater dishonour put upon Gods *goodness* and infinite mercy to make him decree salvation to all, on such conditions, as a few persons only (left to their liberty) shall thereupon be able to be saved, than can be cast meerly on his *justice* or righteousness, to decree that grace, or such grace to these few persons, that shall effectually bring them to that end. And what though, Salvation sometimes be taken also as Election in Scripture, in reference to a mans being brought into the *Ark*, that is, into the Church, and so we are said to be saved by baptism, as it is said, *Save your selves from this untoward generation*, and as they which were added to the Church are said to be *saved*, and as *salvation* is said to be *of the Jews*? What mans reason can serve him to believe that Christ speaks of this *salvation*? If it could, Are there not more that come into the Church, than are eternally saved? There is doubtless a *double Election* and Salvation in Scripture, *Temporal* in this sense before spoken, in relation to a Church-state, and Christs government of us by the Gospel: and *Eternal* in this sense of Salvation whereof Christ is speaking, when he saies, *And few there be that find it*. Such is our Election, and such is this Salvation; Election from Eternity, and salvation to eternity, and

both meet in Regeneration. For regeneration, is Actual Election, and Inchoate Salvation. *There are three that bear record in Heaven, and three in Earth,* saies St. John. These three agree in one, and those three are one. I will say so here, There are three things that bear record in Scripture, *Election, Regeneration,* and *That few shall be saved.* These three agree in one, that is, in their testimony for the Orthodox against the *Arminian*, and so for St. *Austine*, the Synod of *Dort*, and Dr. *Owen*, against this Author. And these three are one, in their concatenation one with another. Election is the preparation of that special effectual grace which works our regeneration, and our regeneration is the begetting in us that life, that spiritual life which runs on to eternity. Effectual grace is the Execution of Election, and entrance of Salvation. Grace is glory in the *infancy*, and Glory is grace in *full age*, at maturity, or in consummation. These things are thus linked, and this is the Chain that holds me. I do endeavour to make the chain as easie as I can, and get as much room in it as I can by going the middle way, but I am held under it. If you cannot break every link, you shall never break any one of them; or if you could, it were in vain to do it. And now would I look into this Gentlemans heart how it can serve him to meditate a reply to these things. I will tell him in his own words the issue it must come to. *But what if the Scriptures teach, that the promise of Regenerating grace are made only to those that are absolutely elected to glory* ( This hereby, I count, is proved in the very root of it ) ? I answer ( saies he )

he ) If this can be once shewn, I have done ; or if it can be made to appear but probable by the Scriptures, I shall begin to suspect all my reasoning against it. For I heartily believe the Scriptures to be the word of God, and all my Reasonings shall submit to this one Proposition, Whatsoever God hath said that is true. This is said well, and so well said as I will end this Chapter with it, and I think we must both end the Controversie with it. They shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them : for he is the Lord of Lords, and King of Kings ; and those that are with him, are called, and faithful, and chosen.

---

## CHAP. V.

*Of the Resistibility or Irresistibility of the Spirits Operations, in reference to his last Chapter.*

**I** Come to the Authors last Chapter, which is, concerning the manner and measure of the holy Spirits operations. And I observe here the Controversie of it, the Doctrine of it, and the Use of it.

For the Controversie of it, it may be reduced to two Questions. Whether the Operations of Gods Spirit be by way of moral swason, or physical operation ? and whether these Operations, or the effectual grace of God on the heart in a Sinners conversion be irresistible ? I will content my self with the last point, unto which the other I conceive, may be reduced ; and this is a controversie (as others be fore )



fore,) which hath the *Arminians*, on one side, and *Synod of Dort* on the other. The Dr. is for the *Synod* we may be sure, and this Author for the *Arminians*. The only thing to be understood between both, is, what they mean by the term *irresistible*? If the Dr. hath received by it an apprehension, as if the work of grace on the soul was such as disarmed the will of its liberty, and left it no power of resisting, according to that saying which this Author quotes for his, that *the Will cannot make use of that grace which it can refuse*, the Doctor is out; for the Will cannot be without natural liberty of refusing or willing, and if that be taken away, it is destroyed: but if herein he be misceited, or his intention perverted, and he does hold only that this work is irresistible in regard to the event, that is, where that grace which is effectual, is given, it will infallibly have its effect, the Doctor is in the right. Again, if this Author, by *resistible*, understands, that where this grace is given, or where the Spirit thus operates, the will hath not only power of resisting, but many times *does* resist, so that Christ may say but to any one who hath *that* grace, *I would, and you would not* this Author is out; for this special effectual grace flows from the decree of Election, and can never fail: but if he mean by *resistible* only that though the will be carried by it, and *does not resist*, yet it hath power still to resist, so that its liberty for all that cannot be lost, he is in the right. The decree of Election, and this grace that flows from it, is not consistent with a *contrary event*, but they are consistent with a *contrary power*, a power, I mean,

to



to do the contrary. They will certainly and infallibly carry the Will, because Gods will must stand, and his decree cannot fail, but the power of doing the contrary, ( or not doing ) is not inconsistent with the certainty of the thing being done. The power of *doing otherwise*, and *doing otherwise* are two things. Where the Decree, and Grace is, they infallibly produce the effect, that we shall not *do otherwise*: but the *power of doing otherwise* is untouched. The thing is *necessary* in regard to the *decree*, and it is *free* or contingent in regard to this *power* in man *to resist*. Man hath *power to resist*, so grace is *resistible*: but it is *irresistible* in regard to the *act* or *effect*. When the power then and liberty remains, this work of God upon the soul is not by such a way of physical operation, as the raising one from the dead, or as creation is, but it is by such a way as is suitable to a free creature, who is brought to act out of election; it is by *Argument* and the *Word*, as well as by the *Divine motion*. It is therefore, for ought I see, neither by meer physical operation, nor only by moral *swasion*, but by an omnipotent *perswasion*. By such a sweet attemperation to the faculties, as will infallibly carry the Will, and yet not by compulsion. If you ask me any farther, I will be excused. I remember Christ speaking of this work, compares it to the *wind* which we cannot perceive, either *whence it comes*, or *whither it goes*. And if we cannot tell the things that are with us, how shall our vessels comprehend the wayses of the most High; the workings, the manner, and the measure of the working, of the Spirit of God? I must add this only

M

which

which is open, Let the term *irresistible* be expounded right, I am for the Doctor; Let the term *resistible* be expounded right, I am for this Author. When I agree then with both of them, if they both will agree with me, we must grow all friends in this point.

For the *Doctrine* of the Chapter it comes to this summ, which I can give here in the words of the Author. The holy spirit of God doth in that manner work his graces in us, that they are still the genuine effects of the Evidence and Motives of the Gospel; Of the natural use of our faculties, the understanding and will; and of our own care and diligence in using the external means of grace. His operations in us make us capable of recovering our selves by degrees; and all the while there is no sensible difference between them, and the natural operations of our minds; and yet we are sure we have his assistance, and help in all the good we do, and without it we can do nothing at all to saving purposes. This is the *Doctrine*, which if no inferences but Orthodox be drawn from it, I take to be sound. We have then some *Use* of it, which is also very good. There is but a little of it, but if he had been *more* in that, and *less* in quarrels with the Doctor, it had yet been all better. And so God bless the hopeful Author in his Studies.

## CHAP. VI.

*Of the Authors Calumniation of Dr. Owen, and some reply to them.*

HAVING thus done with the Book, there are some passages require my reflection upon them, for the Doctors vindication. The Doctor is accused of *Nonsense*, of *Contradiction*, of *Error*. It is fit that some thing should be said in reference to the *two latter*, though it be but a rudeness to go about to answer any thing to the *former*.

For the first therefore I will say this only. If the Doctor hath expressed any thing darkly, that this Author cannot make *sense* of it : such a place, or passage as to him, is to go for nothing. That is all in civility to be said of it.

For the second, There is one instance I will mention about Election. The Doctor in one place of his Book, speaking ( I suppose ) to a prophane person, yet presuming on his Election, tells him, *He cannot believe his Election any otherwise, but as God reveals it by the effects*, that is, untill he believe, and repents he cannot conclude he is Elected. In another place speaking ( I suppose ) to the tender serious Christian, who is yet in trouble about his Election, he saies, *He cannot justly doubt of his Election, untill he be in such a condition, as wherein it is impossible that the effects of Election should be wrought in him*. This the Author makes a contradiction : but it is only the distinguishing between

these two things, A *not concluding*, and A *concluding not*, and the Doctor is cleared. The man who sees not the effects of Election on his heart, and in his life, cannot conclude that he is elected (here is the *not concluding*, which ought to be): And the man that sees them not, cannot conclude for all that, that he is not Elected, because they may be wrought in him before he dies, (here is the *concluding not*, which must be avoided). So the one is rebuked, and the other supported (as they should both be). Such are the Doctors contradictions.

For the third, which is the Doctors Errors, I must distinguish of Error. There is *Human Error*, Error *common to man*, It is the nature of man to be subject to mistake, to be deceived, to err, saies the Orator: and there are *Pernicious Errors*. This Gentlemans accusations are of both sorts.

For the former sort, There is two or three places where this Author is very confident upon the Doctor for his saying that the Spirit is given to us in his *Person* as well as in his *Effects*, which methinks I cannot pass, because I do not know well whether the Error be in the Doctor, or in this Author, or in my self. I am apt to think, that it is *too much* to say that the Spirit dwelleth personally in any man, though we are said to be the Temples of the Holy Ghost: and that it is *too little* to say he is given only in his gifts, graces, or effects. I would say rather, that the Spirit is given *it self* for these Effects. I look upon the Spirit of Christ to be given to us for a principle of life and union with our Head, from whom we have (through this Spirit) the communication

tion of all saving influence unto a holy life. It is the received opinion that there is an habitual righteousness infused by God in the soul for our justification according to the Schools, or according to our Divines, for our Regeneration; and that this is the principle of life and power in the soul unto holy operations. I must confess here I do not receive this Doctrine, I have it somewhere in my *Mediocria*, I think more cautiously, but I do really believe no infusion of habits. I count that the Spirit by a motion on the Will, exciting it to act, does incline it to farther acts by the impression which is made, and that the habit then is acquired by the iteration of those acts and delight in them, or love to them, shed abroad in our hearts by the same *Holy Ghost given to us*. I do believe consequently, that it is the Spirit it self dwelling in us ( as the Scripture understands its own expression ) which is that principle of life from whose constant secret and unperceptable aid, does proceed all those actions which are holy and good, and acceptable to God. I do believe there is a time when Christ gives his Spirit to every one of his Elect, for uniting him to himself as his head, and that this union is effected immediately by that communication, and that through this Spirit all vital influence must be derived to us. I cannot frame my self to say the Spirit is *personally* in us, but he is in Christs members as a *principle of life* and spiritual action, and as the formal band of that union which we have with him. Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that body

are one body ; so also is Christ. I cannot tell well I therefore how to brook some expressions as I find somewhere in this Author, and in another before him, that when the Scripture speaks of our having the Spirit of Christ, and having it so as to be led by him, and if we have not the Spirit of Christ, we are none of his, they are willing to interpret the having Christs Spirit, to be only the being of his temper and disposition, which is the bringing down the Scripture to our ordinary converse, and seems to me unholy. I hope these men do believe the Christian faith, and do reverence his mysteries. And there are these three of them, The mysteric of the Trinity, The mysteric of the Incarnation, and the Mystical Union between Christ and his Church. It is true that Christ is not a Natural head but a Political, as opposed to natural, but not as opposed to mystical. He is a Political head as he governs us, and as we are in subjection to him : but he is also a Mystical head, vouchsafing to us that spiritual influence which enables us to obey him. He governs us, and so is our head: but he governs us by his Spirit which is infused ( though I think no habit be ); and when we are lead by this Spirit, as there is Rule, there is Influence, and this Union must be Real and Mystical, and not that which is Political only. Suppose a man whose head was high as the Heavens, yet so long as the same soul animates all the members, the feet as in the head, it is one man : Christ our head is in Heaven, and we on earth ; yet as the same Spirit is in us which is in him, the head and members make one dy, nay in the words of the Scripture, *one Christ.* O  
Agrippa



Agrippa *believest thou the Prophets?* O thou Author of this Book against Dr. *Owen*, *Believest thou these mysteries of the Christian Religion? I know that thou believest.*

For the later sort, There is one place in his Book, where we have two of his *pernicious* errors together. The Doctor belike hath said, that though a man should reform his life, and be changed from vice to vertue, and that by hearing the word preached ( This is the most I count he saies, and which may be exemplified in *Herod*, who *heard John*, and *did many things* ), yet if there be not an habitual righteousness infused, it signifies nothing to regeneration. To this purpose is it only and altogether the Doctor speaks. Hereupon this Gentleman breaks out and *challenges* him before his *own party* ( as he speaks ) and before the *world*, for contradicting the Scripture [ *He that doeth Righteousness is born of God* ], and then charges him with *Pelagianism*. He professes he is in *earnest*, and that this is *rank Pelagianism*, that the Doctor allows so much to be done without saving grace. I have the more reason to be moved at this, because a certain person of quality, and of a ready judgement having this Author by him, turned me to this place, as if the Doctor was much to be blamed; when I must needs say, that this Gentleman hath no where exposed himself so much in his Book as here, where he endeavours to expose the Doctor. There is no man that reads practical Divines, that lay down characters of the truly godly man, the sound Believer, and how far the Hypocrite may go, but does know they speak commonly as the Doctor does,

does, and there are few, one would think, so inconsiderate or raw; but should also know here how to distinguish so easily, as between the *matter* of what is done, and the *manner* of the performance. Good works may be considered *quoad operis substantiam*, or *quoad modum quo ordinantur ad vitam eternam*. There is no good act (no not the least that can be done) is performed in that manner as it ought, or as it is required to be accepted in order to salvation, but a man must be *born of God* according to *his* text, and have the assistance of the Spirit: But for the *matter* of the work (or of our duty) this Author must consider better, that the Regenerate and Unregenerate are alike as to that. One can hear, and pray, and give alms, and abstain from evil as well as the *Other*; and many times the veryest Hippocrite pretends most. Nay, what saies this Gentleman to *Socrates*, *Aristides*, *Epimonidas*, *Plato*, *Plutark*, *Cato*? What saies he to *Almanzor* that *Mahometan* Emperor, whose life is set out by Sir *Walter Rayleigh* in a little Book for such singular vertues, especially as to his goodness and righteousness, that I find him not paralleld by any Christian. Will this Author censure Sir *Walter* for a *Pelagian*, for such a narration? or will he make me one, if I believe it? Or will he come over here, and when he hath placed such in a *state of Nature*, and so out of a *state of Grace*, will he allow an Heathen or Mahometan to be a *regenerate* person? Hath the Gentleman read *Ruiz*, or one such a kind of Schoolman as he, all over? Let him see when they have denied against *Pelagius* all ability in man to do any thing, even but

to give an occasion ( which is *active* and not *passive* only ) to infuse in us their justifying grace, whether they are also ignorant of some such distinction. It is no *Pelagianism* in the Schools, to say a man can do many things *civily*, *morally* good, through the power of nature, education, custome, for company sake, for glory : but it is so, to say he can do any thing without preventing grace, *in order to his justification*. There is no need therefore of such vehemence, nor of any such expressions, he uses elsewhere [ *I will desire the Doctor to consider whether the Father of lies be not the representative of such shameful Writers, as he is the example of* ]. These kind of words are not well. There is a great deal of acrimony, I see, with a little truth mixt methinks, like the fire and hail that ran together in one of the Egyptian Plagues, in the Books of many late rising adversaries to this learned pious and reverend person. It were happy if the opprobrious words of the prejudicate, would make thewise mend their faults. It were well also if such an inconsiderate confident piece of elation of mind ( as here indeed is ) be but repressed with the shame and blushes of another. *Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness, and let him reprove me, it shall be an oyle, and not break my head.*

## C H A P. VII.

*Of Dr. Owen's Book of Justification, and of the reconciliation of St. Paul and St. James, and the Imputation of Christ's righteousness upon his account.*

**H**AVING said this for the Doctor, I have a little now also to say to him. I was reading his latter Book of Justification, when this Author came to my hands, and I had thought of making some remarks upon it. I am not satisfied with what he hath offered for the reconciliation of St. James and Paul on that subject. This is the reason I suppose ( that is the most solid ) why so many do choose here of late to go with the *Mediocrian*, or steer the *middle way*, in that point. I perceive that Dr. Tully with our first Reformed Divines, and this excellent Doctor, are for distinguishing of *Faith*, and *Justification*, but will not let us, by no means, distinguish of *Works* for the reconciliation of the Apostles. I do wonder at this. The Apostle James and the Apostle Paul do both agree, that we are justified by Faith. The one saies, *we conclude that a man is justified by Faith*; and the other saies also, it is *by Faith*: Their seeming difference is only about works, when one saies *by Faith without Works*, and the other, *by Faith and Works also*. And how then comes it to pass that we must not distinguish of *Works*, but of *Justification* and *Faith*, to compose the difficulty? I will offer the Doctor therefore here one Argument, under his favour, which shall be but one, and that not

not as others have, (so far as I know) for then it were like he had already weighed it. It is this. That Justification which St. *Paul* speaks of, is that Justification which we have in that Text of *Genesis*, where it is said, *And Abraham believed, and it was accounted to him for Righteousness*. Or, That Justification *Paul* speaks of, is that Imputation of Faith for righteousness which is spoken of in that Text in *Genesis*. That Justification which St. *James* speaks of, is that Justification which we have in that Text in *Genesis*, Or, is that Imputation of Faith for Righteousness, as is spoken of in that Text in *Genesis*. Therefore St. *Paul's* justification, and St. *James* justification are the same Justification. Again, That Faith which St. *Paul* speaks of, is the Faith that is spoken of in that Text in *Genesis*, or the same Faith as was imputed to *Abraham* for righteousness in that place. That Faith which St. *James* speaks of is the same Faith which is spoken of in that Text in *Genesis*, Or the same Faith that was imputed to *Abraham* for righteousness in that place. Therefore the faith that St. *Paul* speaks of, and the faith which St. *James* speaks of, is the same faith also. And when the Faith is the same, and the Justification the same, we must distinguish of Works then out of question, to reconcile these Scriptures. Of Works then let us distinguish; and the distinction is this. There are Works which are inconsistent with Grace and Pardon, so that if we had them, we should have no need of Christ's righteousness or sacrifice, but the doing of them would make the reward to be of debt, or make life to be due out of district justice, (He

that doeth them shall live in them ), That is, Works which the Law requires unto Justification. And these are the Works St. Paul speaks of, and the reasons which he alleadges why we are not justified by these Works is, because no man hath them. This is that which he apparently urges ( for he ascends in his dispute from the *Law of Moses*, to the *Law of Nature*, which concerns both Jew and Gentile ) in his three first Chapters to the *Romans*, so that if any man be justified, it must be *without* them. Therefore we conclude ( saies he ) that by faith *without* them ( that is without having them ) a man is justified. There are then Works also which are consistent with Pardon and Mercy though we have them, so that when we have done these, we do need the righteousness and satisfaction of our Redeemer to cover their imperfection, and for acceptation of our persons, no less than if we had Faith alone without any, and these are Works of sincerity required of us in the Gospel. It is no wayes derogatory, I say, to Gods Grace and Christs Merits, for a man to be justified by these works, any more than to be justified by Faith alone, in regard to Debt or Merit, upon which account St. Paul excludes works in his Disputation. It is of *these* Works I must say, ( as the Apostle saies it is of Faith ) that it may be of Grace. And these are the Works St. James speaks of, when he saies, *By Faith and Works* also; that is all one as by a *Faith working by Love* in Pauls words elsewhere. And the being justified by *Faith working by Love*, or by a Faith productive of Works, or by these *Works and Faith* also ( which being such Works as fall short of



of the Law, and do need grace and forgiveness for their acceptation with God) is all one with St Pauls by Faith *without works of the Law*, or without such as the Law requires unto justification. Thus are Paul and James reconciled. I will advance hence then my former argument. That justification by Faith without works which St. Paul speaks of, is that Justification, or that Imputation of *Abrahams* Faith for righteousness, which is spoken of in that Text in *Genesis*. That justification by Works and Faith also, which St. James speaks of, is that Justification or that Imputation of *Abrahams* faith for righteousness, which is spoken of in that Text in *Genesis*. Therefore St. Pauls justification by faith without works, and St. James justification by faith and works also, or *by works and not by faith only*, is the same in the two Apostles. The *medium* upon which all three Syllogisms depend, is the Apostles citing the same Text, both of them, for that which either of them assert, while one saies *by faith without works*, and the other *by works and not by faith only*. The *major* and *minor* therefore in all three are undeniable; and in the conclusion of the last, I am sure the Doctor and I shall agree together.

I have another thing to offer to the thoughts of the Dr. that whereas he tells us of a Commutation between Christ and us in his taking upon him our sins, and our partaking of his righteousness, I do apprehend this expression and doctrine to be Christian, holy and good, according to the sense of that Text, *He was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him*; and the like places:

But only there is a difference to be put between the use of the notion against the *Socinians* in the point of *Satisfaction*, and the use of it against the *Medio-craneans* in the point of *Justification*. I do believe such a Commutation as the Dr. speaks of, is necessary to that great work which Christ undertook for Mankind, as it concerns the whole world in the procuring Reconciliation and Life for all upon the terms of the Redeemer; for if he had not taken on him our sins, to suffer in our behalf (which is his *being made sin for us*) and fulfilled the whole Law also for us, that God might without dishonour to him as Redeemer, dispense with it, so as to impute to us our faith and imperfect obedience for righteousness (which is our being *made the righteousness of God in him*) there would have been no satisfaction offered, and consequently no Reconciliation or Redemption: But as for such a Commutation in the point of Justification, which concerns particular Believers, I am yet to learn what to make of it from this Reverend person. To enquire then to the bottom, the foundation of this *Commutation*, is laid (I see) by him in the Mystical Union between Christ and his Members, which must pertain therefore only to such, and that as a fruit or effect of the Spirit of Christ given to them (if it be so) to that end: When this indeed is a thing that does not belong at all to the operation of the *Third* person of the *Trinity*, but to the work of the *Son*, and the arbitrary ordination of the *Father*. Whatsoever influence Christ hath upon the soul as our Head by the operation of the Holy Ghost; or whatsoever is an effect of the Spirit when once given for

for uniting us to him, it must have this Union for its ground or foundation: But whatsoever arises to us from Christ another way, and is no effect of the Spirit, it may not be ascribed without contradiction to that spring from whence it comes not. The Dr. judges right, that such a Communication with Christ cannot indeed be rationally thought on, but we must conceive of some *Union* presently which is the ground of it: But there is a double Union between Christ and us. The one is by *taking* upon him our *Nature*, and the other by *giving* us his *Spirit*. The blessed Commutation the Dr. speaks of, does not depend upon that Union which we have with him by the Communication of his *Spirit*; for this indeed is no waies any effect thereof: But it does depend on the Union which he hath with us in taking upon him our *Flesh*. *Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also took part of the same.* Again, *He took not on him the nature of Angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham,* and in that seed our Nature; and as he took our nature, he took on him our sins; for he took our nature only to this end, that he might redeem Man, when the Angels whose nature he took not, were not redeemed. *Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me.* A body is prepar'd for Christ, that he may be a sacrifice to answer those Types under the Law, which without him could signifie nothing. The Beast for the Propitiatory Sacrifice had the sins of *Israel* laid on him; and this is exhibited in that saying of *John*, *Behold the Lamb of God that takes away*

away the sins of the world: And of that in *Peter, Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the Tree.* It is manifest then that this Commutation which consists in Christ's taking upon him our sins, that he might be a sacrifice for them, and fulfilling the duty of the whole Law (which we were bound unto, but broke) to procure new terms, in the performance whereof we might be righteous, and so accepted upon the account of his merits (which is his *becoming sin for us, that we might become the righteousness of God in him*, as I have said before, and have need to say again) does belong to that Union which Christ hath with Mankind, according to that Text in the *Hebrews, He that sanctifieth, and they that are sanctified are of one*; that is, of one flesh, as appears by what follows; and not to that Union which he hath with his Members only, according to that Text in the *Corinthians, He that is joyned to the Lord is one spirit*; that is, it belongs to that Union which is *Hypostatical* in Christ's taking our nature with the Divine Nature into one person, and not to that Union which is *Mystical*, according to the supposition of the Dr. There is a distinction then to be remembred, which we have often in Scripture, and that is of *Christ in the Flesh*, and *Christ in the Spirit*. We must make a difference accordingly between what he did for us, as he was in the flesh, and what he does for us *in the Spirit*, or by it. That which he did for us *in the Flesh* (I speak it indefinitely) must belong to *All*, for the flesh he took, was the flesh of *All*; and hence is he said to *die for All*, to *taste Death for every man*, to be a propitiation,

not

not for our sins only, but for the sins of the world. That which he does for us in the Spirit, is peculiar to his Members, and the Elect to whom he gives it. I speak of the Spirit as a principle of Union and Life in Christ, and not as Author of common gifts. I argue now. It is certain that the Righteousness Christ performed, and the Sacrifice he made for us, was performed and made in the Flesh. It is certain that in this Righteousness and Sacrifice is contained all that he undertook in our behalf, as he sustained our part in the work of his Mediation for Man's Redemption. It is certain that the Commutation the Dr. speaks of, must be supposed unto Christ's sustaining our part in this work. It is certain consequently that this Commutation, and the part Christ sustained in the performing this Righteousness, and offering this Sacrifice, does belong to Christ in the Flesh, and so must be universal for all the world, and does not belong to Christ in the Spirit, to be appropriated to his Church or Members only, which is this Learned Drs. apprehension throughout his Book. Let us distinguish then now at last between the Impetration of our Redemption, and all those benefits we have by Christ, and the Application of them. The Impetration belongs to Christ in the Flesh, and the Application to Christ in the Spirit. (I mean by Impetration, obtaining by Sacrifice and Merit, and distinguish it from Intercession). Christ took our Flesh to procure our Redemption; he gives us his Spirit to apply it. Now I have this notion to offer the Dr. under his correction if I be out, and under his candour to receive it, if it be light; that this blessed Commuta-

tion he speaks of, and rightly magnifies, does go to the *Impetration* of our Redemption, and the benefits we have by Christ, and not to the *Application*. If this Commutation between Christ and us, of his Righteousness for our sins, did go to (or was made in) the Application, I see not how any more than one man could have it. If Christ makes the Commutation with *Peter*, and so takes his sins, and gives him his Righteousness in exchange, this Righteousness of Christ must now be *Peter's*, and so *Paul* and *James* and *John* cannot have it. It must not be therefore conceived sure, that this Commutation is made with particular persons, or that it does go into the Application, but that it goes into the Impetration of those benefits we have by Christ, which being procured for all upon condition, there is no particular person but by the performing that condition alike may (and by that means only can) enjoy them, one with another. To make this quite clear, there is but one cloud to be removed, which does (as I suppose) hang on the mind of most, in thinking something more of the Spirit's *Application* of what Christ hath done for us, or of his Merits and Righteousness to the soul, than there is. But this is all that I am able to understand of this Application; to wit, that the Spirit by his grace enables us to perform the conditions upon which these benefits are procured for us; and so they become ours, and the Merits and Righteousness of Christ are said to be so in regard to those effects. They are ours for the *Impetration* of these benefits, but they cannot be ours in themselves, that is, not ours in regard to the *Application*.



cation. What Christ did for us in the *Flesh*, was to reconcile our salvation to God's glory, and the ends of Government: What Christ does in the *Spirit* is to reconcile our spirits to what God requires of us, and so to qualifie us for our possession of the benefits which he hath purchased in the flesh. The benefits are ours, and we enjoy them as being impetrated for us upon that condition, which through the Spirit (given for the Application) we perform, and Christ's Righteousness and Merits being ours in regard to these effects it may be said to be *imputed* to us if our Divines please. If there be conceived any Commutation with Christ of his Righteousness for our sins, or any imputation of it unto us any otherwise than thus in regard to the effects, I understand it not. The principal effect of Christ's Righteousness and Sacrifice (which both together making up satisfaction to God for man's sin, God is reconciled, and comes to new terms) is the obtaining the Law of Grace for us, according to which we may be righteous, or *made the Righteousness of God in Christ*, in the Scripture phrase (See my *Middle Paper* of the Covenants in the six first leaves), and upon this Righteousness, as the condition performed, all other of the effects or benefits depend. In the Application it is true, that we have the benefits, but from whence do they come? It is not from any act of ours, we are not our own Benefactors; nor from any work of the Spirit. That we do, is the performing the condition, and that the Spirit does, is the supplying us with grace to do it: But the condition is not the cause of the benefits, only *causa sine qua non*, which being

put, the benefits flow to us by vertue of the Impetration, from the merit of what Christ hath done. *Many (saies Mr. Truman) make this their strong hold, that faith alone is the receptive grace, and not repentance and sincere obedience : but there is no such thing as receiving Righteousness, Justification, Pardon. Justification, right to Heaven, Righteousness, cometh on men. The free gift came upon all to Justification. By the offence of one, judgment came upon all to condemnation. As condemnation cometh upon men without any act of receiving it, it is a resultancy from the Law upon disobedience : So Justification, right to Heaven, is a resultancy from a Law-promise, the condition being performed. This I look on not only as pretty, but in regard to what I apply it very solid. It is from the Covenant-promise, or through the Law of grace immediately, and so from the Impetration of Christ and his Merits at last (or ultimately) that the benefits come on us, and all that we do towards it, is only our performing the condition. Cometh this blessedness then on the Circumcision only, or on the Uncircumcision also? It is to be observed a little farther, that when the Scripture speaks any thing of this Commutation, we find it attributed only to God and Christ, and that as a thing past and done, and never to the work of the Spirit, which is still a doing. It is said therefore that the Lord hath laid the iniquities of us all, or made all our sins to meet on Christ, in the person of the Father, and that Christ took them, bare our sins, with the like expressions : But I read nor a word of such a work as is still to be done, which the Holy Ghost's*  
were

were, if it belonged to him. It must be conceived therefore that God and Christ in their everlasting transactions between them, about the redemption of Man, agreed upon this matter of Commutation, which (however the Dr. expresses it) in the root, is Christ's undertaking to stand in our stead according to the Law of his Mediation; which Law he performing, this business actually was accomplished, and we have the *It is finished*, declared on the Cross: So that be it whatsoever it will, it does go, or did go in to the Impetration, it cannot go into the Application of our Repemtion. To come home then quite to the Dr. How Christ's Righteousness is imputed to us in regard to the *Impetration* of the benefits we have from him, or how it is made ours in regard to the *Effects impetrated*, as those effects are purchased by it upon *condition*, I understand; but how it is imputed to us, or made ours in the Application by the Spirit in any effect, or in the effect of Justification, any otherwise than other effects, I have had my eyes opened so long about this point, as I begin to see at last with much adoe, nothing of it. Adoption, Salvation, and other benefits, as well as Justification, are effects of Christ's Righteousness, or of Christ's purchase, and when we believe and perform the condition, we receive Adoption, and have a right to Salvation as well as to be Justified. Adoption is by faith, Salvation by faith, Justification by faith. As faith concurs to the one, it does to the other. Here only is the deceit. Justification is Gods accounting a person righteous, and this being upon the account of Christ's righteousness, the understanding is entangled,

gled, as if we were made righteous by his righteousness in some way, as must render us to be justified otherwise by it, than saved. There never was any dispute about the imputation of Christs righteousness to our Adoption and Salvation, and yet it is a certain truth, that it is imputed to us in regard to these effects, as in regard to Justification. The righteousness of Christ then does concur to our Adoption, Salvation, *sub genere causæ efficientis*, as the meritorious procuring cause of them : if it concur any otherwise unto Justification, that is *sub genere causæ formalis* also, as the *formal reason* no less than the *procuring cause* of it, it is a matter ( I must confess ) of my Admiration; and I must crave of the Doctor farther instruction, or the ingenuity to accept this slender endeavour of mine for his own satisfaction. *And the third Captain of fifty went up, and came and bowed before Elijah and besought him, and said unto him, O man of God, I pray thee ---- And he arose and went down with him.*

I have many other thoughts in my mind to offer the Doctor, or this Author, which I will forbear, for I remember that the Gentleman hath a second part to come out, that he intends more particularly against the Doctor. I will therefore stay a while upon such matters that are already proposed, and see if he performs his intention; and it will be then time enough ( if it be like also to do good, and be fit ) to confer a few more notions with him. For I like my man much for his *Natural parts,*

*parts*, and *Free-Divinity*: as I must note him a little for deficient in his *Ethicks* and *Civility*, so long as he hath to do with such an Adversary. I cannot commend him for this usage of the Doctor; who is one I must confess for my own part, that I value for his Worth, I love for his Courtesie, I am pleased with for his Candour, and I think my self happy, if at any time I get but a little of his Company.

---

THE END.

---





READER,

**L**east I should not have occasion (or least I should not take it, if I have) to write again upon these matters, I must tell you of some things I find wanting. I have not commended this Ingenious Person for his very apt Exposition of some Texts, as I think he deserves, if I had examined them well enough to do it. Again, I have not declared my scope in the discourse I have about the Natural and Spiritual man, in the beginning of the Book. If one imagine my scope to be only to confute this Author, he will make little of me, and less of himself. My scope is not to invalidate the Interpretation he brings, which I acknowledge fair: nor to advance the other, which I impute to the Friendly Debater (because I took my first hint from him) but in the cultivation of it any man may see in whose mind it is harbored: Nor do I confirm the Doctors against this Authors opposition, to prefer it before either: But I do impartially endeavour the elucidation of the place, as a searcher after Truth, in this end, that he who hath the best faculty of discerning, may have all the light I have to his own, to make judgement. This is not the manner ordinarily of others. And this I do also, that by such indifferency of mine, I may put some discountenance upon the over-peremptoriness of this worthy Young man, who, when he sees his own Notion to be reasonable,

P

does

does forget that the Doctors, or mine, may be reasonable also. Another thing is this, Unto the Objection against the salvability of Heathen [ because Salvation is by Christ, and they have no Faith in Christ, and no knowledge of him ] I have omitted something at large, that I must give you intimation of here in a little. Salvation is by Christ, I have determined ( I suppose well ) in that he hath procured a Law of Grace by which we are governed, and shall be judged; and so long as the Heathen, or all the world, are under that government of grace as well as we, Salvation must come to them upon the same account of Christ, as it does to us, if any of them perform the Condition. And what if the Heathen knows not this, that it is Christ that hath procured this remedying Law for us, and them, yet is that nothing, as to the truth of the thing, for so it is, and those that live well, have the benefit of it. If a ransom be gathered for the Slave at Algiers, he is freed from his slavery no less for that, because he knowes not the Friends that did it. The Disciples were partakers of Redemption by Christ, when they knew nothing of his Sacrifice till after his death and resurrection. And what did the Jews know, if the Disciples knew no more? For Faith then, As there is a threefold Administration of the Covenant of grace according to the state of the Heathen, the Jew, and the Christian, according to what I have said: So is there a threefold Faith in regard to these three Administrations of it. Faith is diversified according to its Objects, or the Revelations which man has from God. I have not

*room here for Explanation. Though a Heathen hath not that Faith as is required of the Christian under the third promulgation of the Covenant, or was of the Jew under the second, yet hath he such a faith as belongs to the first, and so long as that faith he has, does work by love, or by sincere obedience to God, it will justify him, as ours will. And this is the meaning of that Text, But now is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: The righteousness of God is the righteousness of this Covenant, which hath been ever a foot, as in my Paper of the Covenants I shew, and from faith to faith, is from the faith which was sufficient in the first and second, to that which is now required in the third and last Promulgation of it. I have not said this full enough, but it is necessary to be intimated; And in the the room that is left I must give notice, that I let these sheets be a slicht Book, that my Papers of the Middle Way may be bound up with them, because they are of the same Nature. There was four of these Papers, about five sheets a piece. Of Election and Redemption; Of Justification; Of the Covenant, Law and Gospel; and Of Perfection. They are compleat none of them without one another, for what I found wanting in one Paper, I took liberty to supply in the next, though of another Subject. My work is to dig the Metal, the Refiner is another Trade. The Point of Justification that got out first from me, is not perfectly stated till the Reader hath read both the six and seven first leaves of the Covenants, and the beginning of Perfection. These Papers bound together, I intituled Mediocria, and from thence in*

*these present Sheets I do once or twice call those who are for the Middle way in these Points, Mediocrans. There are several places in them very needful for him to see that reads these present Disquisitions; but six or seven first leaves of the Paper of the Covenants, Law and Gospel ( before I come to treat those Subjects themselves ) I suppose to be most necessary ; though the last Point I think most maturely stated. Those twenty sheets, and these fourteen together will make a sufficient bound Book.*

J. H.

---

ERRATA.

Page 58. line 31. for *discernings* read *deservings*. p.  
92. l. ult. for *dy* r. *body*.

---

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE  
**HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY**

---

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION